SHANNON GAYK

Image, Text, and Religious Reform
in Fifteenth-Century England

CAMBRIDGE

This page intentionally left blank

IMAGE, TEXT, AND RELIGIOUS REFORM IN FIFTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

Focusing on the period between the Wycliffite critique of images and Reformation iconoclasm, Shannon Gayk investigates the sometimes complementary and sometimes fraught relationship between vernacular devotional writing and the religious image. The study examines how a set of fifteenth-century writers, including Lollard authors, John Lydgate, Thomas Hoccleve, John Capgrave, and Reginald Pecock, translated complex clerical debates about the pedagogical and spiritual efficacy of images and texts into vernacular settings and literary forms. These authors found vernacular discourse to be a powerful medium for explaining and reforming contemporary understandings of visual experience. In its survey of the function of literary images and imagination, the epistemology of vision, the semiotics of idols, and the authority of written texts, this study reveals a fifteenth century that was as much an age of religious and literary exploration, experimentation, and reform as it was an age of regulation.

SHANNON GAYK is Assistant Professor of English at Indiana University.

This series of critical books seeks to cover the whole area of literature written in the major medieval languages – the main European vernaculars, and medieval Latin and Greek – during the period *c*. 1100–1500. Its chief aim is to publish and stimulate fresh scholarship and criticism on medieval literature, special emphasis being placed on understanding major works of poetry, prose, and drama in relation to the contemporary culture and learning which fostered them.

IMAGE, TEXT, AND RELIGIOUS REFORM IN FIFTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

SHANNON GAYK

Contents

v

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

Addit.	Additional
EETS	Early English Text Society
o.s.	original series
e.s.	extra series
JMEMS	*The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*
MED	*Middle English Dictionary*
MS, MSS	Manuscript(s)
PMLA	*Publications of the Modern Language Association*
SAC	*Studies in the Age of Chaucer*
YLS	*Yearbook of Langland Studies*

Introduction: reformations of the image

Images and books have long been considered parallel modes of representation. Etymologically, "iconography" is to write with images. Classical authors and Renaissance poets alike appealed to and contested the Horatian literary formulation of *ut pictura poesis* (as is painting so is poetry). Throughout the Middle Ages, clerics often justified images as *libri laicorum*, or books for the laity. Early modern writers spoke of the sisterhood of the arts. And today we speak of "reading" images and of "visual literacy"; we ask our students to consider the imagery of poems; we may even utter the cliché that "a picture paints a thousand words." Yet our muddled metaphors speak both to the surface sameness of and the underlying tension between these two modes of signification: even as we equate the two media, we know that images are not books, that seeing is quite different from hearing. Just as deeply held as our analogical association of image and word is our understanding that we must differentiate between the two types of signs.[1] And indeed, attempts to understand the sometimes fraught sisterhood of visual and verbal signs have a long history. It is the purpose of this book to explore a set of English theorizations of this relationship in the fifteenth century.

Although religious images have never been without their critics, the end of the fourteenth century marked a significant shift in the language and audience of these critiques in England: for the first time, arguments against images were being put forth by lay men and women in the vernacular.[2] The Lollard support of vernacular religious texts and critique of images made what had hitherto been Latinate, academic debates accessible to lay audiences and recast the image/text relationship as one of competition rather than complement. Many of these writers suggested that if vernacular books were available to the increasingly literate laity, there would be little need for visual "books," which could be easily misconstrued and improperly venerated. Moreover, growing lay literacy and a religious atmosphere grounded in affective and incarnational theologies

exerted pressure on traditional justifications of images as *libri laicorum*. The convergence of these cultural changes and new ideas raised a host of questions: How are images different from words? What role would the image play in a society in which the word was the preferred or domin-ant mode of religious teaching? Would images in this society merely be superfluous? Which sorts of signs are easiest for a layperson to interpret?

Many clerics rushed to defend the use of images as substitutes for books, and a number of written apologetics for visual culture appeared in the opening decades of the fifteenth century in both Latin and English. One such defense is found in the early fifteenth-century catechetical dia-logue, *Dives and Pauper*. When Dives inquires about the purposes of images, Pauper first answers:

Þey seruyn of thre thyngys. For þey been ordeynyd to steryn manys mende to thynkyn of Cristys incarnacioun and of his passioun and of holye seyntys lyuys. Also þey been ordeynyd to steryn mannys affeccioun and his herte to deuo-cioun, for often man is more steryd be syghte þan be heryng or redyngge. Also þey been ordeynyd to been a tokene and a book to þe lewyd peple, þat þey moun redyn in ymagerye and peynture þat clerkys redyn in boke.[3]

As we will see, Pauper is parroting the most commonplace argument for image use in the period. More remarkable is Dives' subsequent question; he immediately asks about the last of these points: How do I read this book? That he poses the question (and will do so multiple times) suggests that the centuries-old defense of images as *libri laicorum* was no longer as transparent as the medieval church had assumed. Dives was not alone in raising this question; writings about image use in the following century attempt to answer it again and again.

This book takes up the question as well, examining the collaboration and competition between visual and verbal signs in the century or so between the Lollard critiques of images and the Protestant destruction of them, and asking how fifteenth-century writers responded to Dives' question. It is not my intent to chart a linear narrative from Lollard iconomachy to Protestant iconoclasm, nor from images to books as the preferred medium for lay education. The story is, of course, rather more complex and circu-itous than such an account would allow. The multiplicity of voices and positions represented in the chapters that follow suggests that while many in the fifteenth-century church were committed to reforming the use of images, they do not speak in unison on this issue. My discussion focuses on late medieval England where the issues were most hotly debated, but many contemporary continental theologians also expressed concern about

the proliferation of cult images and their misuse by the laypeople, raising these issues at the Council of Constance in 1415–17.[4] Indeed, most of the texts I consider are written by clerics and reflect the English church's new commitment to the ecclesiastical reforms advocated by the Council and implemented in England under the archbishopric of Henry Chichele (1414–43).[5] The texts herein suggest that the fifteenth century was as much an age of religious reform as it was an age of regulation and that the religious image was an important subject of reformist interest.

The reader will likely soon notice that this is a book about "the image" without any images. This absence is quite intentional. First and foremost, this book examines *ideas* about the religious image – about its uses, abuses, potential, and problems – rather than images themselves. The writers I consider theorize the image in all its forms (textual, mental, physical), though most begin with the material, devotional object. Thus, throughout the book, I use the word "image" as expansively as many of these authors do, to evoke first the material images called into question by many Lollard writers, but also to acknowledge the chameleon quality of the image.[6] Second, the writers herein largely use words to frame, describe, and explain images – sometimes to the point of eliminating the need for the image at all. In other words, they translate, or re-form, visual *libri laicorum* into verbal ones. Although my discussion focuses on representations of the image, it is important that these re-presentations are also re-formations insofar as they first convert one form (the visual image) into another (the verbal image), and second, do so to reform (in the theological sense) perception of images with vernacular texts. In this book, I thus use the term quite literally: to reform is simply to form again. But it is also to renew, restore, or amend.[7] By modeling the appropriate uses of images in vernacular texts, the writers I consider seek to amend the image or at least its reception. They seek to reform both the image itself and the image's audience. Reform is always both theological and aesthetic.

If these fifteenth-century attempts to reform the image suggest renovation rather than demolition of the images they consider, the historical irony is that these texts are now largely imageless. Just as the walls of churches were whitewashed and covered over with verses of scripture in the sixteenth century, so too do many medieval images remain only in the words that circumscribe and describe them.[8] And, in conveying clerical debates about the image in *verbal* books for the laity, these considerations of the visual image both embody and obscure the conflict over the status of the vernacular text. They speak to the close relationship between images and texts but also the growing distance between them as pedagogical media.

The tension between religious images and texts, however, has been relatively neglected in scholarly discussion of late medieval piety, which has directed our attention largely to the essential parity or complementarities of visual and verbal signs.[9] Thus scholars often emphasize how late medieval image and text alike are characterized by what Gail Gibson has helpfully called the "incarnational aesthetic" of the period.[10] Much recent work on the period's vernacular theology has focused on the relationship between the vernacular and corporeal, radical, and affective forms of religious practice and understanding.[11] It thus emphasizes "the image and/or relic's power to move."[12] Because the heterodox critique of material signs and the privileging of the written word is frequently considered marginal to the general tenor of the period and therefore not a significant theological or aesthetic influence on late medieval religious writing, scholars have often approached late medieval vernacular texts and devotional images in this period as complementary forms, seeing both as indicative of the affectivity and corporeality of this governing aesthetic.

This book builds on but ultimately diverges from this recent work and suggests that much fifteenth-century writing in the vernacular is marked by a concern for the *regulation* and *reformation* of affective, visual experience. To this end, I offer new readings of a set of some of the most important and prolific fifteenth-century theologians and poets whose work has previously been understood as dully orthodox, conservative, and even propagandistic.[13] I argue that this writing is characterized by a reformist aesthetic that is in conversation with late medieval forms of visual piety and heterodox critiques of that piety and that is indebted to philosophical discourses, ecclesiastical hermeneutics, medieval historiography, and bureaucratic writ. This book thus considers fifteenth-century writing as literature in its own right, measuring its value neither by its conformity to Chaucerian verse nor by its ability to foreshadow Renaissance humanism, but rather reading it as a considered (if often ambivalent) literary intervention in its own distinctive cultural situation. I argue that many fifteenth-century religious writers, while understanding the power and value of visual representation, also find in vernacular discourse a textual means of reforming the lay response to and use of devotional images.

THE DEFENSE OF THE IMAGE AND THE RELIGION OF THE BOOK

The fifteenth-century responses to images discussed in this book are part of a long tradition of clerical attempts to reform visual representation

and to control responses to it with words.[14] In this section, I will briefly survey this tradition, looking at a few key moments in the early Middle Ages but focusing primarily on late medieval considerations of the relationship between visual and verbal signs. In the earliest "image debates," Christianity was represented as a religion of the book in battle with religions of the image. The early church's rejection of images was largely contingent on its reading of scriptural injunctions against idolatry (and most notably those found in the Decalogue and the *Liber Sapientiae*), but its position also derived from the church's desire to maintain distance between Christian practices and those of the contemporary pagan and imperial religions, in which the veneration of images was commonplace.[15] However, Constantine's conversion and the subsequent rise of Christianity to state religion of the Roman empire complicated this association of image veneration with pagan religion. Soon after the conversion, we find the first extant references to the newly converted laity's desire for images and to clerical fears that the reinstallation of images would only open the door for the return of pagan religion.[16] The question of the validity of images, however, came to the fore in the sixth century when members of the imperial family began bestowing images on churches, and the veneration of Christian images became more commonplace. When some theologians questioned the validity of such veneration, others responded with defenses of images. In two letters chiding Bishop Serenus of Marseille (who had destroyed paintings and statues to protect his subjects from idolatry), Pope Gregory the Great set forth a justification of images that would influence all subsequent debates on images.[17] In these letters Gregory explained to Serenus the following: "Pictures are used in churches so that those who are ignorant of letters may at least read by seeing on the walls what they cannot read in books."[18] As I have already noted, Gregory's emphasis on the pedagogical import of the image became the standard defense of visual art in the West throughout the Middle Ages.[19]

The kinship of image and writing established in this letter remained central to all subsequent debates. In the wake of the eighth- and ninth-century iconoclast controversies in the Eastern church, a synod extended the revelatory and salvific properties of the written word to the icon, arguing that because both word and image could give a person knowledge of the gospel and thus lead to salvation, images ought to be shown the same honor as the scriptures.[20] The synod, however, drew a technical distinction between the degrees of veneration that might be shown to God and to holy signs, distinguishing *latria* (the worship due only to God) from

dulia (the lesser form of worship demonstrated in the reverence shown to people and corporeal artifacts). These distinctions were initially met with some confusion by the Western church, which responded to the early controversies with an outright refutation of image veneration and a reassertion of the primacy of the Word. Commissioned by Charlemagne, the report on images in the *Libri carolini* (*c.* 790) claimed that images should not be venerated; they were to be used as pedagogical tools but not to be compared with the holy scriptures.[21] In 825 a synod held in Paris debated the statements of the *Libri carolini* and issued a letter on images and the iconoclast debates, emphasizing that it may be lawful to own images but it is not lawful to venerate them.[22] Thus the eighth- and ninth-century clerics ensured that while images had some mnemonic value, in the West texts were to maintain a privileged role in conveying knowledge.[23] While the *Libri carolini* may not have had a significant effect on the production of images, their Augustinian warnings about the "aesthetic seduction" of the visual arts and the privileged role of the word in the transmission of rational or abstract thought influenced the rhetoric of later debates.[24]

The twelfth-century Latin treatise, *Pictor in carmine*, reflects this continued worry about the danger unique to visual signs.[25] In the work's preface, the anonymous author laments the "monstrous" images in the church:

I wished if possible to occupy the minds and eyes of the faithful in a more comely and useful fashion. For since the eyes of our contemporaries are apt to be caught by a pleasure that is not only vain, but even profane, and since I did not think it would be easy to do away altogether with the meaningless paintings in churches, especially in cathedral and parish churches, where public stations take place, I think it an excusable concession that they should enjoy at least that class of pictures which, as being the books of the laity, can suggest divine things to the unlearned, and stir up the learned to the love of the scriptures.[26]

Concerned about the seduction of the visible, the author promises to provide alternative images. He acknowledges that it would be difficult to "do away altogether with the meaningless paintings in churches," so he suggests, instead, a model of replacement. The remainder of the treatise provides typological readings of the scriptures, beginning with the Annunciation and concluding with the Apocalypse. These readings are given, the author explains, expressly to supply more appropriate subject matter for the artists, or "to curb the license of painters, or rather influence their work in churches where paintings are permitted."[27] While churches should not be decorated with frivolous ornamentation, which

produces "vain" or "profane" pleasures, the author concedes that they may be adorned with narrative images designed to function as books. In other words, religious images should always point back to the written word. As the treatise claims, their purpose is to "stir up the learned to the love of the scriptures." Thus, for this author, images remain subordinate to the text; visual experience should never be an end in itself.

The positions of the author resonate with broader Cistercian ambivalence about devotional images and ornamentation. In the twelfth century, both the Cistercians and the Carthusians campaigned against excesses in the visual art and ornamentation of churches, arguing that such art was not only superfluous but also potentially dangerous.[28] Perhaps best known from this reformist movement is Bernard of Clairvaux's *Apologia*, which also cautions against the dangers of visual pleasures.[29] While arguing that excessive imagery in churches may detract from the study of the scriptures and the inner worship of God and misappropriate money that could be better spent on feeding the poor, Bernard does not deny the Gregorian justification of images as books for the illiterate. As we will see, all of these concerns and approaches resurface in fifteenth-century considerations of the uses and values of visual and verbal *libri laicorum* in England.

Indeed, many critics of images throughout the Middle Ages assumed a similar position, arguing that images should be useful, not necessarily beautiful or pleasing to the senses.[30] These theologians claimed that the purpose of images is precisely to move the viewer beyond the realm of the external, material, and sensory to that of the internal and spiritual.[31] For contemplative writers, aesthetic pleasure ultimately was not to be found in an experience with the sensory, but rather with that which transcends sense experience.[32] Thus, while monastic writers regularly quote the Gregorian dictum and advocate the use of images as didactic devices, many are rather more cautious about condoning the adoration of images and emphasize instead the purity of unmediated, imageless adoration of the divine.[33]

All of these early attempts to delimit the use of images, however, point to the fact that religious images were clearly very popular and widely used by laity and clergy alike. Cathedrals, parishes, and laypeople continued to acquire and lavish money on statues, stained-glass windows, and painted panels. And while some clerics sought to regulate the use and production of images, many others saw the value of images in encouraging religious fervor. With the increasing interest in the physicality of the incarnate Christ and rise of affective devotional models in the later Middle Ages, ecclesiastical apprehension about the power of images lessened somewhat, and the Gregorian justification was expanded and modified to include

the affective value of images. By the thirteenth century, Aquinas incorporated affect into his own justification for the use of images. Images are useful, he explained, for teaching, for remembering, but also for arousing feelings of devotion.[34] The addition of affect to what had primarily been a pedagogical justification distinguished visual images from texts. To this end, Aquinas' contemporary, Bishop Durandus, suggested that a picture moves the emotions more than writing. Because they are better able to prompt affective response, Durandus continued, images should be shown more reverence than texts.[35]

Although the primary justifications for images throughout the earlier Middle Ages emphasized their didactic uses and thus their relation to texts, by the fourteenth century apologetics increasingly focused on the image's superior ability to stir emotions.[36] The relationship between affect and the visual image is now well known to scholars of late medieval religious literature.[37] Indeed, it is often the primary aspect of the tripartite justification of images that modern scholars now find of interest.[38] Unquestionably, late medieval England was steeped in affective, incarnational devotion. New forms of lay piety, influenced by Franciscan and Bernardine theology, de-emphasized the function of images as pedagogical *libri laicorum* and emphasized "the stirring of emotion rather than the imparting of knowledge."[39] The period's emphasis on the concrete, bodily, and human was accompanied by a transformation in the types of visual and literary art produced and the responses these arts prompted. Devotional texts such as Nicholas Love's influential translation of the *Meditaciones vitae Christi* encouraged their readers to visualize scenes from the life of Christ to arouse devotion and emotional identification.[40] Affective religious lyrics called their readers to "Behold" the suffering Christ and weep. The Corpus Christi play cycles vivified images and provided a means of participation and incorporation by collapsing the boundaries between distant history and collective memory, foreign lands and the confines of the local city streets, and biblical figures and fellow citizens.[41] Sermons sought to inspire religious fervor by recounting miracle-working images. And similarly, collections of *mirabilia*, such as the miracles recorded by Caesarius of Heisterbach, regularly describe images that reward their devotees by speaking, weeping, or even seeking revenge. Images of "a suffering human body racked on a cross" dominated the visual landscape and encouraged their viewers to suffer along with Christ rather than be instructed by him.[42] By the fifteenth century, most images of Christ focused on the "somber and tragic," and as Émile Mâle writes, "Jesus no longer taught; he suffered. Or rather he seemed to

offer his wounds and his blood as the supreme lesson."[43] In short, affective piety and images crafted to encourage emotional response had moved to the center of late medieval devotional practice.

Even though images were firmly integrated into the religious landscape of England, concern about the use of such images remained constant in late medieval clerical dialogues on the subject. As Michael Camille notes, in this period "representations were becoming more difficult to regulate and control, more unruly than ever in their form and variety, breaking boundaries as artists experimented with making them more 'lifelike.'"[44] A number of late fourteenth-century religious leaders articulated concern about the misuse of images. Richard Fitzralph, the archbishop of Armagh, denounced the veneration of cult images of Mary as superstition in 1356. Robert Rypon, preacher and subprior of Durham, similarly voiced distrust of the misleading representations of many visual images.[45] Indeed, in the later Middle Ages, images and image-making remained under the careful scrutiny of the church even if conversations about their validity were not often translated into public discourse.

However, after a long period of widespread acceptance of images with occasional reservations raised in Latin discourses and academic contexts, images once again became a matter of public debate at the end of the fourteenth century when contested by John Wyclif and his followers. Indeed, after Wyclif, to question the value of religious images or their veneration was to risk suspicion of heresy. Yet Wyclif's own position was remarkably conventional. Wyclif argued that images might be useful as *libri laicorum* or as aids to devotion but should not be venerated with either *latria* or *dulia*.[46] Thus, for Wyclif, although Christians might lawfully use some images, there was still need for caution, as he explains in a tract on the Decalogue:

It is evident that images may be made both well and ill: well in order to rouse, assist, and kindle the minds of the faithful to love God more devoutly; and ill when by reason of images there is deviation from the true faith, as when the image is worshiped with *latria* or *dulia*, or unduly delighted in for its beauty, costliness, or attachment to irrelevant circumstances.[47]

Literalist readings of the first commandment are often starting points for Lollard discussions of images, but Wyclif's approach to images here is not particularly radical; he is simply rearticulating clerical commonplaces evident in earlier works such as *Pictor in carmine* and Bernard's *Apologia*. But in Wyclif's articulation we find in embryonic form the multiple threads that orthodox and heterodox writers alike will use to weave arguments for

and against religious images over the next century of polemic: material form and human response are interrelated; well-constructed images are useful insofar as they inspire the faithful to more pious feelings of devotion.[48] However, badly made images distract from "true faith." According to Wyclif, they do so in two ways. First, they inspire veneration rather than use, directing the viewer's attention to the image itself rather than pointing the reader to what the image signifies. Second, their beauty or ornamentation becomes a source of inordinate pleasure or delight. Moreover, ill-made images call attention to their excesses – to their costliness or their inappropriateness. They do not simply represent; they seduce.

Although Wyclif's comment ostensibly focuses on the *form* of images – on how they are made – it also implicitly addresses their *reception*. However the image is made, its viewer is responsible for worshipping or delighting in the inanimate artifact. Idolatry, then, may begin with the form of the image, but ultimately occurs by human misinterpretation and misuse of the image. Many people err and even commit idolatry, Wyclif writes, in thinking that there is any life in images and in believing that any one image is more powerful than another.[49] For this reason, he continues, the clergy must instruct the laity about image use, not only by insisting that images be "well made" but also by informing them of the danger of misinterpreting material signs.[50]

This tangled web of agency is replicated in the anti-image polemics of Wyclif's followers. Although the extent of iconophobia and iconoclasm in fact varies widely in extant Lollard writings, the issue of images seems to have served as a litmus test for determining late medieval heresy. Some Lollard critics of images emphasize that idolatry derives predominately from the form of the image itself, while for others it is found more in human misunderstanding or misreading of the image. Regardless of emphasis, most Lollard writers follow Wyclif in locating agency (and thus blame) in a combination of the object itself and the response of its audience. Yet if Wyclif held a quite traditional position on images (arguing for their pedagogical use but against their veneration), his followers became known for their distrust of visual signs.[51] Arguing against the dangers of images in one breath and for the value of vernacular scriptures in the next, Lollard writers often suggested the replacement of image with word, recasting the relationship as antithetical rather than analogous. The Lollard preacher, William Thorpe, argued that if priests were living holy lives and preaching regularly, "Þese þingis weren sufficient bokis and kalenders to knowe God bi and his seintis wiþouten ony ymage maade wiþ mannes hond."[52] To be sure, for many Lollards, the best mode of

reforming image use was found in replacing images with texts. However, as the first chapter of this book explores, this was not the only Lollard approach; some Lollards adopt Wyclif's more moderate assessment of images. Indeed, as W. R. Jones noted some time ago, "Many of the apparent novelties of the Lollard critique of images were, in fact, truisms of contemporary reformist opinion."[53]

Even so, the vernacular critiques of images and arguments for vernacular texts provoked a multifaceted response by the English church: Archbishop Arundel's 1407–09 Constitutions censored vernacular religious books and advocated image use; many clerics issued Latinate rebuttals of Lollard positions; and affective, imaginative vernacular texts were offered as orthodox alternatives to the English scriptures.[54] After the Constitutions, orthodox writing on images often took a strong stance against any critique of devotional images. Indeed, the defense of religious images became central to the fifteenth-century ecclesiastical agenda in England. Accused heretics, for example, were often required to take oaths saying that they would worship images and not disdain pilgrimages.[55] It seems evident that late medieval clerics were generally committed to the defense of religious images against what they perceived to be the iconoclastic threat of the Lollards.

Yet many of these early responses to the Lollard critique of images continued to be articulated in Latin. The Dominican Roger Dymmok, for example, wrote sixteen chapters defending Christian image use against the Lollard critique in his late fourteenth-century *Liber contra xii errores et hereses lollardorum*.[56] Although Dymmok adopts the Gregorian dictum, he ultimately asserts that images are pedagogically superior to texts because they offer more immediate cognition: "ille ymagines expressius et immediacius easdem conclusiones nobis insinuant" (these images bring to us the same conclusions more clearly and immediately).[57] Throughout his defense of images, Dymmok draws heavily on early justifications of images, distinguishing between *latria* and *dulia* and following John of Damascus in arguing that the Incarnation of Christ justified future representations of the divine.[58] But Dymmok was not alone in defending the use of images against the Lollard critique. The Dominican prior, Thomas Palmer, also composed a Latin defense of images and had it delivered at St. Paul's in London in 1398.[59] Thomas Netter offered a Latin rebuttal to Lollard ideas about images in his *Doctrinale*, as did the Carmelite compilers of the *Fasciculi zizaniorum*.[60]

Other clerical writers offered more ambivalent considerations of images. Walter Hilton, like many of his monastic and clerical predecessors, is

wary of a too easy apprehension and description of the transcendent. In
Hilton's writings, images are permissible and useful but are superseded by
written texts. While, as Nicholas Watson has shown, "much of Hilton's
early thought is iconoclastic," Hilton later wrote a conventional treatise
in defense of images, *De adoracione ymaginum*.[61] In both this treatise and
in sections of *The Scale of Perfection*, Hilton recommends the veneration
of images with extreme caution but also notes that images are books for
the laity: "quod scriptura clericis, hoc pictura laicis solet exhibere" (as
writing to clerks, so does a picture exhibit to the laity).[62] Remarkably,
Hilton admits that people will misuse images and may commit idolatry,
but that, as Kathleen Kamerick puts it, "good intentions will make up for
ignorance and error in image worship."[63] On the continent, Jean Gerson
advocated the use of images but insisted that they must be accurate rep-
resentations of the scriptures: "one must prevent acceptance as true of any
untrue representation which expounds the scriptures incorrectly."[64] Later
in the fifteenth century in England, Alexander Carpenter's preaching
handbook, *Destructorium viciorum*, discussed idolatry at length, imply-
ing that Christians should exercise caution in venerating any image.[65] As
these examples should suggest, there continued to be a range of orthodox
opinions on the value, uses, and dangers of images among late medieval
clerics.

   To be sure, for many laypeople and perhaps many clerics such Latinate
debates remained inaccessible, and images remained the dominant *libri
laicorum*. But even if academic debates were not widely circulated among
the laity, the spread of lay literacy in this period, the Lollard critique of
images, and the demand for religious writing in English complicated
traditional justifications of images as *libri laicorum*. By the early fif-
teenth century, laypeople increasingly had access to religious writing in
the vernacular and thus ostensibly had less need to be taught by means
of images. With the increased availability of vernacular religious books
in the fifteenth century and the sometimes vitriolic critiques of images,
defenders of images had to negotiate a complex constellation of issues.
No longer was it simply adequate to mouth the Gregorian metaphor that
images are *libri laicorum* when the laity could read and understand writ-
ten texts.[66]

   As we have seen, some writers, such as the anonymous author of *Dives
and Pauper*, used vernacular texts to instruct the newly literate laity in
the right use of images.[67] Yet even as Pauper cautiously advises Dives
that images are to be used as books, not as objects of worship, contem-
porary sermons often encouraged the exact opposite response to images,

emphasizing the miraculous powers of visual artifacts, relics, and pilgrimage sites.[68] While these two divergent, yet orthodox, approaches to the image in late medieval England indicate a clerical desire to regulate lay piety, their differences also reveal the spectrum of regulatory and explanatory methods in the later Middle Ages. In the approach adopted by Nicholas Love and many sermons, images are themselves regulatory insofar as they limit the type of devotional materials accessible to lay audiences to "milk" of light doctrine and affective piety rather than "the mete of grete clergy and of hiȝe contemplation."[69] In this view, images and imaginative texts provide sufficient basic instruction and allow a degree of imaginative freedom but do not lead the layperson to the sort of abstract speculation that could prompt theological questions. By insisting that lay devotion remain in the realm of the corporeal or material (whether this meditation is prompted by physical images or imaginative texts), clerics like Love delineated the boundaries of appropriate religious experience for the layperson.

Other writers saw these affective images as dangerous precisely because they enable an experiential authority that challenges ecclesiastical authority (as Margery Kempe's *Book* suggests).[70] Some clerics continued to be uncomfortable with the potentially subversive excesses of such affectivity and sought to mediate the veneration of such images with accompanying texts.[71] Indeed, many writers found such linguistic definition to be increasingly necessary after 1350 as English churches began to abandon sequential or narrative wall paintings in favor of independent scenes painted in panels between windows and other architectural features.[72] Since isolated and unexplained "imagery could become the subject of veneration, superstition, and decoration," as Vincent Gillespie notes, images in this setting were often accompanied by "text tables [that] could inform and admonish and educate."[73] However, the explanatory *tituli* accompanying religious images were often in Latin, making them inaccessible to the lay audience for whom instruction would be most beneficial.[74]

Yet explanatory texts were not limited to *tituli* or text tables positioned beside images in cathedrals and parishes. Even though the defense of images was primarily under the jurisdiction of theologians, its resonance with basic hermeneutic, aesthetic, and literary concerns also made it of great interest to late medieval poets and writers. This book examines some of those fifteenth-century writers who sought to reform image use with explanatory texts.[75] Following in the tradition of their clerical and monastic predecessors, they accept the validity of images when they are properly used as pedagogical devices but, like Dives, they also see visual signs as

fraught with ambiguities and in need of contextualization and interpretation. The writers I consider offer a range of vernacular textual alternatives or accompaniments to the image: Lollard authors attempt to remedy the "false" representation of contemporary images with imaginative texts; Thomas Hoccleve investigates the epistemological certainty of vision and visionary discourses; John Lydgate uses poetry to teach his readers how to interpret images as would biblical exegetes; John Capgrave emphasizes the importance of historicizing image use; and Reginald Pecock advocates the importance of reason in interpreting both visual and textual signs. There are, of course, many places where these approaches overlap. In particular, each consideration is driven by a commitment to help the laity better "read" visual experience. Further, these writers recognize that the relationship between image and text is changing and seek to respond appropriately. By examining religious writing in English in the wake of the Lollard critique, this book thus seeks to understand the ambiguities of the changing relationships between devotional images and texts as they most likely would have been understood by reformist clergy and represented to the laity.

Moreover, this book argues that just as these writers seek to revitalize and reform traditional thought about images by deploying a new medium of expression – the vernacular – so too might we begin to recognize the richness of reformist modes of medieval devotion by attending to the forms through which they were expressed. Seeking to mediate between forms of lay piety dependent upon visual signs and an emerging literate piety deriving its authority from texts, these writers model important reformist responses to the changing religious environment of late medieval England. The reformist aesthetics generated by these explorations not only reflect the particular historical moment of post-Lollard England, but also, and more importantly, take up a particular position in relation to history, tradition, and form. These authors' negotiation of theological and aesthetic discourses and their combination of old forms with new modes, of clerical discourses with the vernacular, and of images with texts demands that we devise a reading practice adequate to their subtlety if we are to match the efforts of the very writers we are only now beginning to reclaim.

Lollard iconographies

An *ethical fairness* which requires "a symmetry of everyone's relation" will be greatly assisted by an *aesthetic fairness* that creates in all participants a state of delight in their own lateralness.

Elaine Scarry, *On Beauty and Being Just*[1]

[T]ruþe þat wolde make many blynde to se if it were yknowe is þis: þat God is nowher fair serued, saue þere þat his lawe is fair kept.

The Lollard sermon, *Omnis plantacio*[2]

John Wyclif's quite conventional assertion that images "may be made both well and ill" apparently did not articulate a strong enough case against visual media for many of his fifteenth-century followers.[3] Indeed, it is often noted that one of the most consistent features of Lollard texts is the critique and rejection of devotional images.[4] Yet while many Lollard writers equated image veneration with idolatry and advocated the replacement of visual *libri laicorum* with textual ones, as this chapter will show, other Lollard writers represented the visual in more measured terms and used vernacular texts to help readers learn to distinguish between "false" and "true" images and, more broadly, between misleading representations and edifying ones.[5] A set of moderate Lollard sermons, for example, draws out these distinctions by means of imaginative antitheses. In the Christmas sermon, the preacher asks his listeners to imagine the Nativity scene by posing a series of questions:

Wher weren þe grete castellis and hye toures, wiþ large halles and longe chaumbres realli diȝt wiþ doseris, costeris, and costious beddes, and corteynes of gold and selk, able to þe birþ of so hiȝ an emperoure? Where weren þoo rial ladies and worþi gentel wymmen, to be entendaunt to þis worþi emperise, and bere hire cumpenie at þat tyme? Wher weren þoo knyȝtis and squieres to brynge seruice to þis Ladi, of noble metes, costeli arayes, wiþ hoote spices and denteuous drynkes of diuerse swete wynes? (60/251–59)[6]

The sequence draws upon description, verbal repetitions, and lists of objects, materials, and people to construct an image of the Nativity while simultaneously calling it into question. The passage is remarkably adjectival: the series of spatial adjectives ("grete," "hye," "large," "longe") suggest architectural grandeur; the repetitions of "real" (royal), "worþi," and "costeli" emphasize class and value. Similarly, the lists of material objects formally mimic the excesses of the scene. Yet the *ubi sunt* ("wher weren") that frames these descriptions rhetorically points to absence even as it evokes a scene of material plentitude. And so, by means of questions, lists, and lavish description, the passage simultaneously critiques the image it so suggestively evokes.

However, this sermon neither merely offers a critique nor simply deconstructs images of riches (as we might expect a Lollard text to do). Instead, the preacher crafts the image to emphasize the importance of right seeing:"Heere men may see, *whoso biholdeþ wel*, gret pouerte in þe aray at þis lordes birþe" (60/243–44, my emphasis). Immediately following the list of initial questions is a second list in which the preacher replaces the first series of images with a more scripturally accurate picture of Christ's birth:

In stude of þe real castel arayed wiþ riche cloþes, þei hadden a stinkynge stable in þe hyȝe wey. In stide of real beddes and corteynes, þei hadden non oþer cloþes but suche as longede to a pore carpenteris wyif in pilcrimage. In stide of cumpenie of knyȝtes and ladies þei hadden but pore Joseph, her housbounde, and two doumbe beestes. (60/260–65)

Here, the "costious" and "real" furnishing and fabrics are replaced with plainer, more mundane ones. And Mary, rather than being depicted as "þis Ladi," is "a pore carpenteris wyif." Thus the emphasis on royalty in the first sequence finds its verbal antithesis in poverty. While no less sensory than the first, this description reflects a decidedly different set of values and models a different aesthetic: one that locates "fairness" not in embellishment or ornateness but in scripturally accurate or truthful representation and social relations.

This passage thus rhetorically enacts a central Lollard concern about images (that they misrepresent) and models one response to it (to provide a truer representation). Yet the sermon does not exactly offer the substitution that we have come to expect of Lollard texts (of images with texts). Instead, the passage uses textual imagery to replace a false image with a true one. Even as the writer substitutes verbal *libri laicorum* for visual ones, he continues to rely upon and implicitly acknowledge the power of the image and the imagination. In this respect, many Lollard writings share with their orthodox contemporaries a reformist approach to

visual culture: like the other fifteenth-century writers discussed in this book, some Lollards use language to teach their readers to see better; they seek to regulate and reform the interpretation of visual signs with verbal ones. As this Lollard preacher articulates it elswhere, they use language to "teach the blind to see." In short, rather than eschewing the visual, some Lollard writers appropriate it for their own ends.[7]

This chapter examines a series of moderate Lollard texts and makes a case for a distinctive, morally inflected Lollard iconography, an appropriation of visual modes and imagery – such as *ekphrasis, descriptio*, and *similitudines* – as media for the critique of devotional images, and a mode of teaching readers how to interpret them. These mimetic modes call upon readers to imagine and visualize and, in so doing, embrace the power of the visual even as they denounce its material manifestations. In other words, the rhetorical forms that Lollard writers use to stage debates on the danger of religious images reveal their simultaneous participation in and ambivalence about the literary and visual modes of their contemporaries. The use of such rhetorical modes suggests that at least some Lollard writers follow Wyclif in distinguishing between well-made and ill-made images and use verbal *libri laicorum* to teach others how to approach visual ones.

As my opening example demonstrates, Lollard iconographies draw heavily on antithesis to call attention to the ontological and representational tensions of divine kenosis: that in the Incarnation, God not only became human, but became poor, and in so doing revalued plainness, poverty, and simplicity.[8] Reflecting the representational model suggested by kenosis, Lollard iconographies are surprisingly incarnational – seeking to embody ideas with concrete images and figures, embracing images of the human body, animal life, and the natural world.[9] And as we will see, these imaginative affiliations are evident across a wide range of Lollard texts, including satirical poetry, polemical treatises, and sermon literature. Taken as a whole, this corpus suggests that Lollards are much less iconoclastic and much more interested in the ways images and the imagination might be utilized for reform than scholars have hitherto assumed.[10]

To be sure, the notion of Lollard iconography will seem odd or even oxymoronic to many readers, especially given Lollard diatribes against both visual and verbal ornamentation. The use of imaginative language to teach visual literacy may be especially surprising; after all, Lollard writing is often read as distinctively unimaginative and "suspicious of aesthetic pleasure."[11] This may be true for some Lollard writings, but such generalizations rely, at least in part, on an assumption that Lollard texts must be marked by a literary austerity that corresponds to their distrust of material signs.[12] These

assumptions are not entirely ungrounded. Lollard writings often do call for a comparison between visual and verbal signs and frequently denounce all forms of expression designed to please the senses. But even as Lollard writers represent verbal ornamentation as a mode of verbal trickery, in practice they often embellish their texts with appeals to their readers' imaginations.

In this chapter I explore this apparent tension and argue that imaginative description is not hypocrisy but rather a natural outgrowth of the ideological goals and theological positions of many Lollard texts.[13] These Lollard writers take a reformist stance toward the image: while some Lollard texts are interested in replacing images with texts, those that I consider here seek to re-form images using texts and thus to regulate vision itself.[14] In so doing, as later chapters in this book will demonstrate, Lollard writing is very much part of the mainstream conversation about visual and verbal representation and represents one end of the spectrum of literary attempts to reform the image and its use. The chapter begins with a brief consideration of Lollard ideas about the relationship between visual and verbal *libri laicorum* and the truth-telling capacities of the two media. The heart of the chapter explores this commitment to crafting representations that might be vehicles of truth by examining the descriptive practices of the aforementioned Lollard sermons and the alliterative poem, *Pierce the Ploughman's Crede*. Through close formal analysis, I show how some Lollard writers not only deconstruct the corrupt, "false" iconographies provided by their culture but also attempt to reform them by constructing an alternative set of iconographies. These writings repeatedly juxtapose the aesthetically "fair images" offered by the church with the ethically "fair images" embodied by the poor. Thus I turn briefly in conclusion to the ethical and aesthetic valences of Lollard notions of fairness. While there were clearly some Lollards who felt that the only viable remedy for image veneration was to renounce the visual altogether, many others appropriated the tropes and discourses of contemporary visual piety and literature to redirect veneration from false images to true ones and from dead images to living ones.

"sensible signes": truthful representation in image and word

Openness and truth-telling are central to Lollard ideas about translation, hermeneutics, and representation. The prologue to the *Wycliffite Bible*, for instance, emphasizes the translator's desire to make "þe sentence as trewe and open in English as it is in Latyn…[and] to seie þe truþe in

couenable manere."[15] Thus, textual representation should be both accurate and appropriate ("couenable"). But this commitment to truth-telling extends to other sorts of signs. Exploring the relationship between truth, lies, and "sutel words," a Lollard sermon suggests, more generally, that signs have been divinely ordained to teach truth but can be distorted and misused: "Eche lyere misvsuþ þe signes of God, in as miche as alle signes ben ordeyned of God for to schewe þe truþe" (48/146–48).[16] This commitment to truthful representation shapes Lollard assessments of "sensible signes." As this section will show, words and images function as analogous signs for many Lollard writers and are judged by the same ethical and representational criteria. In other words, for many Lollards visual and verbal signs might both function as *libri laicorum*; however, both media become erroneous signifiers when they are not "maad truli" or when they engender social injustice. The visual antithesis central to Lollard iconographies, this section shows, is rooted in Lollard understandings of the importance of truthful signification and the ethical demands of fairness. In short, these twinned concerns – truthfulness and fairness – undergird Lollard representational strategies.

This is not to suggest that the Lollard critique of "sensible signes" and insistence on the vernacular translation of the Bible did not challenge the ecclesiastical privileging of visual signs as *libri laicorum*. Certainly, Lollard writers overwhelmingly hold vernacular texts to be clearer signs than images. Yet many Lollard writers did not hold heterodox beliefs about images. Like earlier theologians, these more moderate reformists warn of the seduction of the sensory, advocate the pedagogical and mnemonic uses of images, and appropriate the *libri laicorum* metaphor. For example, in its entry for "Ymage," the Lollard *Rosarium* reiterates that "Forwy þat Scripture is to þam þat redeþ, þat giffeþ peyntorye to ydiotes seyng it, for þai, ignorant or vnknowyng, seeþ in it wat þam ow to folow."[17] A Lollard tract on the Decalogue expands the Gregorian justification even further: "And so if a clerk shal worschepe his boke, thane may another man worschepe an ymage."[18] This tract takes a decidedly anti-iconoclastic stance: images should *not* be destroyed precisely because they are like books for those that "cunneth no letterure."

If moderate Lollard writings argue that images and texts might be treated as analogous signs, other Lollard texts use the Gregorian analogy to critique "fals" images as "books of error." For example, the author of the "Thirty-Seven Conclusions" argues:

Þouȝ ymagis maad truli þat representen verili þe povert & þe passioun of jhesu crist & oþere seyntis ben leful & þe bokis of lewid men bi gregori & oþere

doctouris : neþeles false ymagis þat representen wordli glorie & pride of þe world as if crist & oþere seyntis hadden lyvid þus & deservid blisse bi glorie & pompe of þe world ben false bokis & worþi to ben amendid or to be brent. as bokis of opin errour or of opin eresie agens cristene feiþ.[19]

The governing framework here is the same one asserted by the late medieval church: images are analogous to books. Where this author diverges from this commonplace is in his insistence that images may be heretical or erroneous just as books may be heretical or erroneous. The rhetorical parallels of this passage also reveal more of what is at stake in the juxtaposition of "true" and "false" images. Whereas "false ymagis" represent temporal power, wealth, and pride, images "maad truli" represent the poverty of Christ and the saints. And, although "true images" might function as books for the laity, "false ymagis" deserve the same fate as erroneous or heretical books: reformation or burning.[20] It follows that as important as how representations are read is how they are made.

In other words, the forms of *libri laicorum* should be as truthful as their content. We see this interest in form again in the "Tretise of Miraclis Pleyinge," which argues against the pedagogical value of miracle and mystery plays:

we seyn þat peinture, ȝif it be verry wiþoute mengyng of lesyngis, and not to curious, to myche fedynge mennus wittis, and not occasion of maumetrie to þe puple, þei ben but as nakyd lettris to a clerk to riden þe treuþe. But so ben not myraclis pleyinge þat ben made more to deliten men bodily þan to ben bokis to lewid men. And þerfore, ȝif þei ben quike bookis, þei ben quike bookis to schrewidenesse more þan to godenesse.[21]

The analogy is again the standard one, but the passage's qualifying "ifs" and intensifying "tos" are essential to its meaning. Images are only valid if they are true ("verry wiþoute mengyng of lesyngis") and if they are not too costly or elaborately designed ("curious").[22] In short, images must be accurate and plain representations of their subjects. When they meet these criteria, they *might* function in the same way as "nakyd lettris." However, when they occasion immoderate pleasure or veneration (as this author believes that miracle plays do), they become books of shrewdness more than goodness and the source of heresy and idolatry.[23] Similarly, after critiquing excessive imagery in churches, *The Lanterne of Liȝt* argues that if images are "*treweli* peyntid … to brynge to mynde as Gregor seiþ þe passioun of Iesu Crist & martirdam of seyntis" they may serve "as lewid mennes bookis" (my emphasis).[24] As these examples should suggest, many Lollard writings on both visual and written *libri laicorum* articulate concerns about the image's truthfulness in terms of the aesthetic or

formal excesses of "curious" images and texts. Form and content must both be true for the image to be licit. Hence images "maad truli" might serve as acceptable books for the laity, while false or curious images are too implicated in institutional corruption to serve as pedagogical tools.

If Lollards rarely deny that images are somewhat *like* books, they often assert that images and words signify in divergent ways. Whereas the written or heard text is seen as hermeneutically transparent, the materiality and seeming vivacity of the image always threaten to obscure the relationship between signifier and signified.[25] For this reason, as the *Rosarium* suggests, "licence of ordinyng ymagez wiþout autorite of scripture is ful bisily to be expouned to lewde men, noȝt only in seying þat þai may be wele made, bot it behoueþ bisily for to expovne in particuler þe perile & þe profete."[26] For this author, images should be interpreted for the unlearned. And such exposition, for many Lollard writers, requires first calling attention to how an image is inappropriate or false. Thus, the values of truth, openness, and precision inflect Lollard ideas about appropriate and inappropriate modes of representation, be they visual or verbal.

We could easily multiply descriptive examples of Lollard concern about inappropriate representations. A few will suffice. Most famously, Lollard writers frequently referenced contemporary iconographies of the Trinity as an "old husbondeman hauyng in his kneez God his Son crucified, & God þe Holy Goste a dowfe desendyng to boþe" as an example of how "ill-made" images mislead their viewers in attempting to render invisible realities visible.[27] Images of ornamented crucifixes also came under Lollard censure. An anti-fraternal poem from British Library, MS Cotton Cleo B.II, attacks one version of this iconographic commonplace:

> First thai gabben on God, that alle men may se,
> When thai hangen hem on hegh on a grene tre,
> With leves and with blossemes that bright are of ble,
> That was never Goddes son, by my leute.[28]

Although contemporary iconography of the crucifixion sometimes linked the tree from the Garden of Eden with the cross to emphasize their figural association, the passage mocks such representations, pointing out that Christ was not, after all, hung on a tree bursting with bright flowers.[29] The cross is problematic to this literalist poet primarily because the image is not the thing itself. However, the critique here is also a *formal* one. The depiction of the crucifix may be beautiful, but it is problematic insofar as it aestheticizes the crucifixion to the point of misrepresentation and perhaps misrecognition. It renders an object of scorn one of beauty.[30]

Thus, in Lollard terms, it is hypocritical and false. This point and specific example are also made by the treatise on "Images and Pilgrimages," which notes that since Christ was made human, "it is suffrid for lewid men to have a pore crusifix" in order to remember his "harde passioun and bittere deþ"; however, the error comes when the crucifix is adorned and thus misrepresents the Passion. Such erroneous visual books, the author continues, are "worþi to be brent or exilid, as bokis schulden be ȝif þei maden mencion and tauȝten þat Crist was naylid on þe crosse wiþ þus myche gold and siluer."[31] For many Lollards, fairness is thus bound up in what is judged to be truthful or appropriate.

Yet notions of what constituted representational truth varied in late medieval England. While the fifteenth century may have been marked by an "incarnational aesthetic," much of its art emphasized transcendence of the earthly, physical realm. For example, a set of fifteenth-century verses on the appearance of Christ describes his countenance in detail, stressing its perfection:[32]

> No reprefe was fun þare,
> In nose nor mowthe, cheke nor chyn.
> His berd was multiplyed wele with hare,
> Lyke to downe both fayre & clene …
> With cowntenance swete & schynyng eene,
> With dyuers fayrnes in þaim being.[33]

Here Christ's moral purity is recast as physical beauty, and, though human, he shines as if already transfigured.[34] Such imaginative reconstruction of the image of Christ by medieval writers was informed in part by a more expansive notion of "truth" than Lollard positions allowed.[35] In Nicholas Love's *Mirror*, for instance, truth does not consist only of the factual; it may also include events that "bene not written in þe Gospelle" but that can be known through "diuerse ymaginacions."[36] As the above examples suggest, Lollard writers are rather more wary of "diuerse ymaginacions" not grounded in scripture.[37] Yet it is precisely at those moments when Lollard writers express concern about the improper use of the image that their own literary methods become particularly imaginative, descriptive, and even visual.

Such appeals to the imagination are typically as driven by moral and political ends as by any formal concerns. Just as Lollard discussions about material images are usually politicized, so too their imagistic writing renders aesthetic questions as ethical issues. In this view, rich or elaborate images both obscure the economic disparities that make them possible and misrepresent the "true" image or narrative as provided in the

scriptures. Lollard *descriptio* seeks to remedy this economic disparity and misrepresentation. In so doing, Lollard writers substitute a reformist iconography, one that is based on opposition and antithesis, that finds fairness in just and true representation.

Antithesis is not, of course, original to Lollard writers. In fact, it is a commonplace of medieval rhetoric and poetics. As Augustine had argued, "The so-called antitheses are indeed the most beautiful of the embellishments of speech."[38] Similarly, Geoffrey of Vinsauf discusses *oppositio* as a mode of *amplificatio*.[39] For Lollard writers, antithesis serves both as a mode of articulating doctrinal paradox (most notably that of the Incarnation) and as a way of throwing into relief untruthful or unjust representation. In an important study of poems in the *Piers Plowman* tradition, Helen Barr notes that many common terms of Lollard texts (such as "trewe," "false," and "reverse") "are actively constituted in difference, and a difference that is antagonistic … their meaning is substantially constituted by their antonym."[40] Yet this oppositional language is not merely antagonistic. In many cases, Lollard writers employ antagonistic language to call attention to representation itself. In so doing, antithetical discourse teaches readers how to interpret representations but also serves as a mode of re-forming misleading signs.[41]

In sum, for many Lollard writers, form and representation are bound up with truthful content and utility, but this does not mean that Lollard writings shy from the representational or imagistic modes of their contemporaries. The following two sections examine the visual and literary manifestations of Lollard attempts at visual "truth-telling," exploring Lollard use of antithetical *ekphrasis* and *descriptio* as a means of re-forming images through imaginative texts. Although I will focus on a set of Lollard sermons and on the alliterative poem, *Pierce the Ploughman's Crede*, many Lollard writings, as I will demonstrate, draw on contemporary visual and literary modes to help their readers see the dangers of images but also seek to replace "ill-made" images with "well-made" ones.

"YMAGES TREWLY PEYNTED": THE ART OF *DESCRIPTIO* IN LOLLARD SERMONS

We turn first to the Lollard sermons with which this chapter began. The short collection contains sermons on the gospel readings corresponding to the Sarum Missal for sixteen days in the liturgical calendar, beginning with the first Sunday in Advent and ending with the fifth Sunday in Lent. While these sermons have received relatively little critical attention, their

affiliation with Lollardy has been questioned, in large part (I would suggest), because they are self-consciously "literary."[42] The homiletic prose of these sermons is characterized by homely details, lively analogies, extended metaphors, carefully crafted descriptions, and dramatic dialogues. Many of these details and analogies are drawn from the ordinary experiences of rural life. In particular, the author frequently elaborates on bestiary commonplaces, such as in his extended comparison of a preacher with a rooster whose crowing at the light of day signifies the true preaching of God's word (16/145–46).[43] In contrast, idle preachers are described as dogs with mouths so full of "worldeli muk" that they cannot "berk þe lawe of oure Lord to hire sugestis" (83/105). The sermons compare a vainglorious man to a "hen þat, as tyme as sche haþ leide an eie, sche makeþ grete noise" in order to be praised for her labor (136/185–88). Covetous men are like a "dunge hil" that "roteþ and stynkeþ" (146/526), and the rich are likened to wortworms (146/543–46). Similarly, man's flesh is described as a "boor of þe wode" that strikes with the tusks protruding from its mouth (signifying gluttony), naps in "foule slowis" (sloth) and leaves a stench everywhere it goes (90/336–57). The sermons compare other figures to sheep, horses, and oxen in what becomes an allegorical barnyard by the end of the collection.

The justification for this lively description is found in the "bodily" examples given by Christ in the scriptures. The author situates his textual practice as imitating the rhetorical model of scriptural parables, which is authorized by Christ himself. To this end, the sermon cites the scriptural narrative of Christ's figural use of the "sensible signe" of a fig tree: "Crist 'putteþ' heere a bodili ensaumple of conforte aftur wynteris stormes, in hope of somur þat comeþ soone aftur: 'Biholdeþ,' he seiþ, 'þe figge tree, and alle trees. Whanne þei brynge forþ frute of hemself, ȝe knowen þat somer is niȝh'" (29/681–84). The elaboration of these natural images, the author suggests, both points the hearer to spiritual realities and helps him or her remember the lesson conveyed. Just like a goose that easily shakes water off its feathers, God's word, the author proclaims, sometimes "gooþ in at þe ton eere and oute at þe toþer" (96/99). Images (even verbal ones), on the other hand, are more easily remembered than expository speech.[44] What Lollards elsewhere pejoratively call "sensible signes," this author implies, can be put to good use as sermon examples.

The sermons construct a rationale for all of this verbal ornamentation that relies on the spiritual efficacy of the "true" preacher, whose role is to labor "hertli" in the vineyard of the text. One sermon uses the metaphor of watering a garden, arguing that priests should carry in their hearts "þe

watir of doctrine of Hooli Writ" and be ready to water the souls of their listeners. In preaching it to the people, they "moiste hire erþely hertes þoru grace of his blessid reyn, so þat þei moun springe in goode wille and brynge forþ leeues of edificatorie wordes, and floures of mylde and honeste conuersacion, and after frute of goode werkes" (18/218–22). The labor of preaching produces life: leaves and flowers and fruit. Virtuous words beget virtuous words and an enlivening of the spiritual senses.

Opposed to the metaphors of the organic growth that results from the preaching of Holy Writ are images of stagnation of the spiritual senses. Whereas the preacher, we are told, "þorouȝ vertu of þe word of God, makeþ blynde men for to see" (35/167–68), an excessive reliance on the material is deadening. The critique of ecclesiastical excess extends from the luxurious array and idleness of priests to the external adornments and "sensible signes" of the material church itself, which like the corrupt clergy "wiþoute … is feire and wiþinne voide" (41/419–20). For this reason, an excessive trust in dead "ymages ȝoten or grauen wiþ mannes hondes" (rather than in the living word) is ultimately destructive:

For alle suche (as þe Hooli Goost seiþ bi Dauid, þe prophete) þat tristeþ in hem ben maad like to hem; for þei han iȝen and seeþ noȝt, as þese ymagis han, for þei seen wel wiþ hire bodili iȝen of wham þei ben maad, and of what metal, and ȝet þei beþ blyndid in hire gostli iȝen, wenynge þer be vertu in þat grauen þynge. (114/312–17)

The passage derives from Psalm 113 and reproduces a common argument in Lollard writings on religious images: those who trust in images will become like them, senseless and spiritually dead. Both have eyes but cannot see. In other words, trusting in the senseless image reflects and contributes to a deadening of the spiritual senses of the viewer. There is a fundamental reciprocity in the relationship between religious images and their viewers, between the realms of the sensory and the spiritual. And, as many moments in the other sermons reveal, this reciprocity can be rendered redemptive when the bodily eyes and ears are trained not to trust in the sensory realm but to see through it.

Thus, education in perception is central to the spiritual goals that underlie the rhetorical practices of these sermons. Throughout the sermons, the preacher reminds his audience that "þe moost necessarie þynge þat we myȝte axe of God is oure goostli siȝte, þat is: þat iȝen of discrecion be opened in oure soules" (119/484–86). The inner eyes must be opened in order to see spiritually and socially. One of the preacher's tasks, then, is to teach the blind to see, to read signs correctly. Throughout the set of

sermons, this particular preacher seeks to prompt this reorientation of his listeners' spiritual vision first by evoking images and then by deconstructing them. The sermons also ask their hearers or readers to call images to mind but ultimately deconstruct and reimagine the images in order to call into question misleading representations and the material excesses of late medieval piety. In so doing, they construct textual images in descriptive layers in order to strip them away and replace them with reformist substitutions.

The cycle's opening sermon introduces the imaginative antitheses that will govern much of the subsequent description. The sermon is an exegesis of the four comings of Christ: his Incarnation; his life long journey toward his death in Jerusalem; his spiritual advent through the Holy Spirit during baptism, preaching, or repentance; and his earthly return at the "Dai of Jugemente" (1–2/10–56). Although the heart of the sermon is a reading of Christ's spiritual advent into the hearts of his followers, the preacher lingers in the opening lines on the earthly coming in order to juxtapose Christ's poverty with the material excesses of contemporary prelates and priests:

He cam mekeli and wilfulli toward Jerusalem, where he wiste wel he schulde suffre deþ, ridynge poreli vpon an asse, trussid wiþ a fardel of his disciplis cloþes, and a fole folewynge, and xij pore men folewinge sempeli on her feet. And heere auȝten proude men of þis world, but principalli prelatus and prestis, be sore aschamed to see her Lord and her Mayster, whom þey schulden principalli suen, ride in þus pore aray, as is seide bifore, and þey to ride so proudeli in gai gult sadeles wiþ gingelinge brideles and v score or vi score hors of prout arayid men, as þouȝ hit were a kynge rydinge toward a reuel, and her chariottis wiþ her jeweles goynge tofore ful of grete fatte hors fed for þe nones. But fer beþ þe true disciplis of Crist from þis arai. (1–2/22–34)

Here, Christ rides "poreli" upon a donkey and is accompanied by twelve "pore men" who follow "sempeli" on foot. At first glance, this description seems relatively conventional. In the *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Christ*, Nicholas Love likewise emphasizes the simplicity of Christ, writing that Christ "despisede fully al þe pompe of veyn worldes wirschipe, hauyng instead of golden harneys & curiouse sadeles & brideles simple cloþes and hempen heltres."[45] But the similarities end here. Love juxtaposes Christ's simple entry with what he is due as "kynge of kynges." The Lollard preacher, on the other hand, uses sparse description of the simple poverty and austerity of Christ and his disciples to call attention to the excess of contemporary priests with descriptive details. The priests ride on golden saddles with jingling bridles and a lavishly arrayed retinue.

This description (and especially its use of the rare term "gingelinge") bears a striking resemblance to Chaucer's description of the monk from the General Prologue of the *Canterbury Tales*: "Ful many a deyntee hors hadde he in stable, / And whan he rood, men myghte his brydel heere / Gynglen in a whistlynge wynd als cleere / And eek as loude as dooth the chapel belle."[46] In both cases, the ecclesiastical chariots are jeweled and their horses, perhaps like the priests themselves, are overfed and fat.[47] This juxtaposition sets the tone for the remainder of the sermons, which, like many reformist texts of the late fourteenth century, are critical of temporal excess and urge a return to the apostolic ideals of poverty and simplicity through both their advocacy of ecclesiastical disendowment and their emphasis on labor.

As I discussed earlier, this antithetical mode is especially apparent in an example from the sermon for Christmas day, a relatively straightforward exposition of the Nativity account as given in the second chapter of Luke. As we saw, the appropriation and alteration of the *ubi sunt* motif here ("Wher weren þe grete castellis and hye toures …?" 60/ 242–57) serves a number of purposes. First, and perhaps most obviously, the repetition and parallelism is a rhetorically effective preaching technique being employed by the author to emphasize his point and engage his audience. Second, it provides a visualizable foundation for the figural reading that constitutes the remainder of the passage, which implicates hypocrites who claim to follow the example of Christ's poverty while dwelling in luxury. Finally, given the emphasis on sight in the passage's opening lines ("Heere men may see, whoso biholdeþ wel, gret pouerte in þe aray at þis lordes birþe"), we might say that this series of questions subtly challenges aspects of contemporary visual depictions of the Virgin and child, seeking to replace them with a "truer" image.

With this description, the preacher evokes the contemporary iconography of the Nativity scene. Such appeals to the congregation's physical sight and imagination are common in sermon literature of the period.[48] In a sermon for Saint Margaret's day, John Mirk, for example, appeals to an image of Saint Margaret: "Herfor Margret ys payntyd oþur coruen … wyþ a dragon vndyr her fete and a cros yn her hond."[49] The verbal picture provided by the Lollard author is less explicit than Mirk's ekphrastic gesture but is consistent with late medieval depictions of the Nativity as found in books of hours and miniatures in other illuminated manuscripts. Its description of the stable as a "hous stoundynge in þe street, keuerid aboue and opene on euery side" (59/234–35) is without precedent in the scriptural text but attested in other contemporary depictions, both visual

and textual. It would have been easy for listeners to call to mind images in which Mary reclines on a scarlet bed with thick pillows, and the missing walls of the "hous" are hung with curtains decorated with trefoils and quatrefoils. Like their visual counterparts, many literary depictions of the Nativity emphasized its grandeur. The roughly contemporary alliterative poem, *Cleanness*, for example, suggests that although the holy family was poor, "Watz neuer so blysful a bour as watz a bos þenne, / Ne no schroude hous so schene as a schepon þare … And þer watz rose reflayr where rote hatz ben euer, / And þere watz solace and songe wher sorȝ hatz ay cryed."[50] The *Pearl*-Poet sanitizes the scene of birth, emphasizing its cleanness, grandeur, and perfumed air. The following lines add a group of courtly attendants ministering to Mary ("alle hende þat honestly moȝt an hert glade, / Aboutte my lady watz lent") and mood music provided by an angelic orchestra.[51] This sort of gentrified and sanitized representation of the birth of Christ must have been familiar to the author of these Lollard sermons.

The author, however, takes an entirely different approach – evoking this courtly image only to call attention to its hypocrisy. The repeated "where weren" questions of the sermon first ask their hearers to imagine these lavish images of the setting of the Nativity, but then deconstruct the iconography and reconstruct an alternative image of the scene:[52]

In stude of þe real castel arayed wiþ riche cloþes, þei hadden a stinkynge stable in þe hyȝe wey. In stide of real beddes and corteynes, þei hadden non oþer cloþes but suche as longede to a pore carpenteris wyif in pilcrimage. In stide of cumpenie of knyȝtis and ladies, þei hadden but pore Joseph, her housbounde, and two doumbe beestes. (60/260–65)

Consider again the antithesis here. Image by image, the preacher replaces the rich scene of Christ's birth with a starkly realistic and rural one. The castle becomes a stinking stable. The material of the sumptuous beds and silken curtains becomes the ragged clothing of traveling pilgrims. And finally, the royal attendants become Joseph and the animals residing in the stable as the *ekphrasis* is stripped of its descriptive excess to reveal a scene of poverty and simplicity.

Yet this emphasis on poverty is not unique to Lollard representations of the Nativity. Again, Love's *Mirror* provides a helpful comparison:

þei miȝt gete none herbere in none hous, bot in a comune place by twix tweyn houses, þat was hiled aboue, men fort stand þere for þe reyne, & was cleped a Diuersorie. þei were nedet to rest inne, & abide al þat tyme. In þe which place Joseph þat was a carpentary made hem a closere & a crach for hire bestes … Joseph also honouryng & wirchipyng þe child god & man, toke þe sadel of the

Asse, & made þerof a qwischyn oure lady to sitte on & a suppoyle to leyn to.
And so sat þe lady of al þe worlde in þat simple araye byside þe crach.[53]

Although Love seeks to help his readers envision the homeliness of the
scene, insisting on its simplicity, Mary remains "the lady of al þe world" and
Joseph becomes her industrious servant, crafting first a crèche for their ani-
mals and next a rough throne (consisting of a cushion and back support).

As Love's description suggests, descriptions of Christ's poor birth
were quite conventional in late medieval England. But once again the
Lollard preacher uses the image as an opportunity to critique the mater-
ial excesses of the church: "Heere moun feynide ypocrites be sore ascha-
med, þat seyn þat þei folewen Crist in pouerte next of alle men heere in
erþe, þat seyn þat Crist was born in so pore a place and þei dwellen in so
rial placis of halles, chaumbris, panteries, boteries, kechenes, and stables"
(60/265–69).[54] The list thus formally mimics the material excesses that it
critiques, countering the sole "pore" place of Christ's birth with an abun-
dance of rooms. To imitate Christ, the sermon implies, requires the rejec-
tion of such material and spatial excess. This sermon next broadens this
critique of temporal endowment to include all who refuse to do the labor
to which they are called. The message of Christ's birth, the sermon con-
tinues, did not go to temporal rulers, but to poor and simple shepherds,
and further "not to necligent and slewful scheperdes lyinge in her beddes,
and suffrynge þeues to stele her schep … but to diligent and wakynge
scheperdes" (62/344–48). The juxtaposition of opposing images returns us
to the paired themes of poverty and labor. Thus, the reformation of con-
temporary iconographies by means of antithesis and opposition shows the
Lollard preacher to be critical of the excesses of contemporary preaching
and piety (which, of course, we expect of Lollard writers), but also (and
perhaps more surprisingly) willing to adapt prevalent visual and literary
modes in order to reorient his listeners' imaginations to the "fairness" of
the everyday, the homely, and the plain. In so doing, the Lollard preacher
helps teach "blynde men for to see" (35/168).

"WONDERLIE WELL YBELD": *PIERCE THE PLOUGHMAN'S CREDE*

These reformist, oppositional iconographies are even more evident in *Pierce
the Ploughman's Crede*, an anonymous alliterative verse anti-clerical satire
dating to the last decade of the fourteenth century that explores the ten-
sions between lay desire for verbal signs and the institutional commitment
to visual ones.[55] The *Crede* uses antithetical *descriptio* much like the Lollard

sermons but more clearly and at greater length. The *Crede* offers an account of a layperson in search of a text (he desires to learn the Creed) so that he might make confession. The narrator's quest is thus framed by the pursuit and acquisition of textual knowledge: the poem opens with the lay narrator's decision to seek out someone who might teach him his Creed and concludes with the Creed itself. It divides into roughly two parts: the first half details the narrator's encounters with the four orders of friars and their surroundings; the second narrates his encounter with Peres, a poor plowman.

While both halves share anti-fraternal rhetoric and an interest in images and words, the narrator's journey is clearly meant to be a progressive one in which he learns how to assess and read signs. In a reading of the poem that emphasizes the ways in which its pedagogical program is ultimately anti-intellectual and even iconoclastic, John Scattergood notes that "this is very much a poem that distinguishes between those texts which mislead and those which can be trusted."[56] Helen Barr similarly observes that the "opposition between 'tales' and 'trouthe' forms the key narrative staple of contrast in the *Crede*."[57] Teaching its readers to distinguish between true and false signs is certainly a central polemical aim of the poem. But like the Lollard sermons, the poem explores these distinctions by constructing sets of antithetical images; the anonymous author offers rich, orthodox iconography in the first part of the poem only to substitute it with Lollard iconography in the second half. The first part of the poem draws upon the sensuous qualities of alliterative verse and *ekphrasis* to call attention to how easily the desire for religious education and texts can be derailed by the seduction of the visual and material. By the end of the poem, we find that we are not unlike the friars insofar as we are seduced by the visible, captivated by "ill-made" forms. Yet the central opposition of the poem is not between images and texts but rather between true images and false ones. Indeed, the poem seeks to educate the reader's vision, to teach the reader how to see by making her more aware of true, or "well-made," images.[58]

Like other contemporary religious texts (such as Thorpe's *Testimony, Dives and Pauper*, and the Lollard *Dialogue Between Jon and Richard*), the poem expresses its catechetical interests through a series of dialogues. It opens firmly situated in the conventions of traditional lay piety, invoking the cross, the Trinity, and the standard pattern of lay instruction (education in the Paternoster, Ave Maria, and Creed).[59] The poet will slowly but systematically deconstruct the institutional and catechetical framework established in the opening lines. He will replace the narrator's desire for confession to a priest with a more efficacious (if less official) confession to

a passing plowman. Indeed, the invocation of the alphabet ("myn A.b.c."), which marks the elementary learning of the primer, serves as a marker for the poem's interest in literacy and foreshadows the tension that the remainder of the poem will explore between the knowledge derived from material culture and textual knowledge.

Although the poem begins with a devout lay reader in search of texts, we soon discover that the only *libri laicorum* that the institutional church will provide him with are the visual ones. On his quest to learn the Creed, the narrator first encounters a Franciscan friar, whom he asks to direct him to a Carmelite who has promised to teach him his Creed (62/38). Laughing, the Franciscan inveighs against the Carmelites as hypocrites and claims that "we Menures most scheweth / The pure apostelles life" (65/103–04):

> For we buldeth a burwgh – a brod and a large –
> A chirche and a chapaile with chambers a-lofte,
> With wide windowes y-wrought and walles well heye,
> That mote bene portreid and paynt and pulched ful clene,
> With gaie glittering glas glowing as the sonne.
> And myghtestou amenden vs with money of thyn owne,
> Thou chuldest cnely bifore Crist in compas of gold
> In the wide windowe westwarde wel nighe in the myddell,
> And seynt Fraunces himself schall folden the in his cope,
> And presente the to the trynitie and praie for thy synnes.
> Thi name schall noblich ben wryten and wrought for the nones,
> And, in remembraunce of the y-rade ther for euer.
>
> (66/118–29)

There is no critique here. Quite to the contrary, the friar offers this description with no small amount of pride. Not only does the friar see the fraternal house, its church, and its chapel as beautiful but also as having a commendable devotional end. With its high walls and large windows glittering with sunlight in the stained glass, its images of Christ and the saints, the friary is a monument of ecclesiastical power and mediation. But if these images bespeak fraternal power, they teach little else. Although the friar offers textual inscription to the narrator, neither the texts nor the images function as books for the laity. However impressive they might be, they remain self-referential signs, referring only to their own creation and maintainance. What can be read in these windows is only the "remembraunce" of those that endowed them. The writing therein is a fraudulent, opaque sign, much like the "boke" that will be offered to him later in the poem by an Augustinian friar (75/326–29), which, as Scattergood notes,

"is not something from which one can learn the rudiments of Christian doctrine, like the primer, but a document designed to give authority, to look official … and to obtain money."[60] Thus, the friar's initial description of the fraternal house suggests that, despite its beauty, neither its visual nor its verbal *libri laicorum* will provide the teaching that the narrator seeks.

When the eager narrator makes his way to this foundation he finds it even more impressive than he expected, but he does not find himself any closer to learning the text that initiated his quest. Instead, his desire to learn the Creed is temporarily forgotten, derailed by the sensory seduction of the fraternal house:

> And whan y cam to that court y gaped aboute.
> Swich a bild bold y-buld opon erthe heighte
> Say I nought in certeine siththe a longe tyme.
> Y yemede vpon that house and yerne theron loked,
> Whough the pileres weren y-peynt and pulched ful clene,
> And queynteli i-coruen with curiouse knottes,
> With wyndowes well y-wrought wide vp o-lofte.
>
> <div align="right">(67–68/156–62)</div>

The narrator's immediate response is that of wonder. He gapes and looks "yerne" (eagerly) on the building. It apparently renders him temporarily speechless. The scene is as sensually seductive to the reader as it is to the poem's narrator; as his eyes move from the whole to particulars, from the "bild bold" to pillars and windows and walls, the reader is simultaneously seduced by the rhythm of the alliterative verse and the mental images that the description prompts. We do not only "see" the scene with the narrator, we hear it as we linger on the images emphasized by the alliteration: the "bild bold y-buld" and the "pileres … y-peynt and pulched." The author masterfully appeals to multiple senses. Sound and sight, word and image are, for the moment at least, aligned in purpose.

To be sure, the sensory seduction has only begun. We next follow the narrator inside the foundation, progressing from the external view to the internal spaces. He enters the walled spaces of the cloisters and observes private gates for the priests, orchards, and well-maintained arbors, and then notes

> a curious cros craftly entayled,
> With tabernacles y-tight to toten all abouten.
> The pris of a plough-lond, of penyes so rounde,
> To aparaile that pyler were pure lytel.
>
> <div align="right">(68/167–70)</div>

With this comment, which is almost an aside, comes the first hint that this golden bowl may have a hidden flaw. As Bruce Holsinger has argued, the comparison of the cost of the cross to the price of farmland represents a sort of "critical gazing" that throws into relief the economic realities that ecclesiastical extravagance simultaneously relies upon and obscures. More subtle, perhaps, than the descriptive juxtapositions of the *Lollard Sermons*, this first aside suggestively evokes the antithetical aesthetic that governs the poem. What is unique about these ekphrastic architectural descriptions, Holsinger further explains, is the poem's "repeated effort to remind its readers *even in the midst of its own ekphrastic performance* of the social conditions that make this performance possible."[61] While this aside may constitute a restrained critique, it also could be read as simply emphasizing the value of the cross. Either way, it draws a comparison that will be fleshed out (quite literally) in the second half of the poem.

However, immediately after noting the great "pris" of the cross, the narrator turns his attention elsewhere, preferring to continue to explore his surroundings rather than reflect on the price of one element of the building. The reader is necessarily also denied this opportunity. Here again, the narrator finds everything to be

> wonderlie well y-beld,
> With arches on eueriche half and belliche y-corven,
> With crochetes on corners, with knottes of golde,
> Wyde wyndowes y-wrought, y-written full thikke,
> Schynen with schapen scheldes to schewen aboute,
> With merkes of marchauntes y-medled bytwene,
> Mo than twenty and two twyes y-noumbred.
>
> (68/ 172–78)

The beauty of the edifice generates both wonder and more ekphrastic poetry. The entire space – with its arched, carved walls, shining stained-glass windows, and golden accents – prompts poetic *descriptio* rather than critique. The author thus draws us into the scene, helping us visualize it as the narrator progresses through it. While the author notably never appeals to the inexpressibility topos, he continues to evaluate the worth of the materials by comparison and juxtaposition. Just as the cross is worth more than the price of plowland, "Ther is none heraud that hath half swich a rolle, / Right as a rageman hath rekned hem newe" (69/179–80). The ekphrastic catalogue both is compared to and reads like contemporary mercantile catalogues – describing and listing the worth of the various parts of the building. Moreover, here again, the material space and its objects are compared to a series of authoritative or economic

documents: merchants' marks, herald rolls.[62] In emphasizing the catalogic as well as sensuous nature of the ekphrastic sequence, the author also calls attention to the poem's participation in the standard conventions of late medieval alliterative poetry.

Moreover, the poet invites the reader to participate in the sensuousness of the alliterative verse as she imagines the opulent setting. But descriptions of this sort are not limited to the stylization of the alliterative mode. In fact, the *Crede* reproduces poetically what other Lollard texts, such as *The Lanterne of Liȝt*, outline more polemically:

Miche peple demen it a medeful werke to iape mennes iȝen wiþ curiouse bilding & manye veyn staring siȝtis in her chirchis, but Ierom forbediþ þis þing … Manye bilden wowis & pilars of þe chirche. Þei vndirputten schynyng marbel stoones. Þe beemes glistiren al in gold. Þe auters ben dyuerseli araied wiþ preciouse stoones. But of þe mynystris of God þer is no choise, no riche man leie to me þe temple in Iurie, boordis, lanterns, sencers, pannes, cuppis, mortars, & suche oþir made of gold.[63]

Both the *Crede* and the *Lanterne* articulate more than a little anxiety about the visual seduction of "curious" objects. The *Lanterne* ascribes blame (and power) to the makers of images and the images themselves, claiming that the proliferation of these material images ultimately blinds "goostli siȝt þat ȝe mai not know þe gospel to þe trewe vndirstanding."[64] The *Crede*, on the other hand, refrains from explicit statement of condemnation or blame in the first half of the poem but strikingly calls the reader to participate in the "veyn staring" denounced in the *Lanterne* before juxtaposing it with the images better suited to "trewe vndirstanding."

If their modes of argumentation are dissimilar, both texts are characterized by lists and catalogues of specific materials and objects and spaces, by visual inundation and layering of descriptive detail.[65] As the ekphrastic sequence continues, the economic inequities inherent in ecclesiastical endowment are increasingly brought to the fore. The tombs that the narrator next observes are made of alabaster and marble and "clad for the nones." They represent knights and "lovely ladies" in splendid, "gold-beten" garments. Yet the narrator cannot resist another juxtaposition: "Though the tax of ten yer were trewly y-gadered, / Nolde it nought maken that hous half, as I trowe" (189–90). Such verbal repetition and juxtaposition merely compounds the sense of visual and material excess. When the narrator enters the refectory he finds another grand hall, one fit "for an heygh kynge" (70/204), adorned with large tables, brass washbins, glass windows suitable for a church (rather than a dining hall). As the narrator continues to explore the grounds, he sees more of the same: noble

houses, "Chambers with chymneyes, and chapells gaie" (70/209), dor-
mitories, kitchens, infirmaries, "and all strong ston wall sterne opon
heithe, / With gaie garites and grete, and iche hole y-glased" (70/213–14).
Again, *The Lanterne of Liȝt* offers a similar list, remarking that the mater-
ial church should "schewe no pride, neiþir outtrage passingli; ouer þe
boundis of pouert, neiþir in stoon, tymber or leed, neiþir in glasse, lyme
or plaistir, neiþir in belle laumpe or liȝt, neiþir in chalise booke or vest-
ment, neiþir in stepile seetis or peynting, or oþir hournementis þat longen
to þis chirche."[66] Such lists emphasize that the material surfeit of many
churches, their proliferation of rooms and ornamentation, is vanity rather
than any service to or instruction of the laity.

   While the lists and repetitions may delight the senses of the reader,
the relentlessness of the catalogic descriptions also calls attention to both
the sameness and the eerie lifelessness of the space. The lists rhetorically
reflect the visual excesses of the friary. As the gaping, gazing narrator con-
tinues to make his way through the foundation, he comes

> to that cloister and gaped abouten
> Whough it was pilered and peynt and portred well clene,
> All y-hyled with leed lowe to the stones,
> And y-paued with peynt til iche poynte after other;
> With kundites of clene tyn closed all aboute,
> With lauoures of latun louelyche y-greithed.
> I trowe the gaynage of the ground in a gret schire
> Nolde aparaile that place oo poynt til other ende.
> Thanne was the chaptire-hous wrought as a greet chirche,
> Coruen and couered and queyntliche entayled;
> With semliche selure y-set on lofte;
> As a Parlement-hous y-peynted aboute.
>
> (69–70/191–202)

As in *The Lanterne of Liȝt*'s list above, we have here detailed descriptions of
both objects and the materials from which they are made – lead-plated pil-
lars and walls, painted tiles, tin conduits, brass basins. If lingering on and
listing the materials suggests excess, the language itself calls attention to the
scene's visual redundancy. The second line of this passage is an only slightly
modified version of two earlier descriptions. Before the narrator has encoun-
tered the church, the friar tells him of the windows and walls "That mote
bene portreid and paynt and pulched ful clene" (66/121). The narrator uses a
similar phrase when he first gapes at the exterior of the "bild bold," observing
"Whough the pileres weren y-peynt and pulched ful clene" (68/160). Even
while the holdings and decorations of the church are treated as a catalogue,
there is a sameness to them, mirrored by the poet's verbal repetitions.

What is strikingly absent from all of these descriptions is any evidence of human life. The scenery bears the marks of past human presence and labor (evinced by the proliferation of passive constructions indicating that all of these things have been *made*), but the church and monastery are represented as little more than museums, full of beautiful but dead artifacts. It is only after all has been seen and described (over the course of sixty lines of ekphrastic verse) that the narrator remembers his original purpose and seeks out the teacher that he had ostensibly been looking for the entire time. He re-enters the refectory and finds a Dominican friar sitting on a bench:

> A greet cherl and a grym, growen as a tonne,
> With a face as fat as a full bledder
> Blowen bretfull of breth, and as a bagge honged
> On bothen his chekes, and his chyn with a chol lollede,
> As greet as a gos eye growen all of grece;
> That all wagged his fleche as a quyk myre.
> His cope that biclypped him wel clene was it folden,
> Of double worstede y-dyght doun to the hele;
> His kyrtel of clene whijt clenlyche y-sewed;
> Hyt was good y-now of ground greyn for to beren.
>
> (70–71/221–30)

The image of the friar might be mistaken for that of an architectural relief or statuary. He is part of the scenery, white as a sepulcher and static except for the subtle quivering of his flesh like a "quyk myre" (quagmire). And despite its emphasis on "cleanness," this description seems structured to arouse disgust. It also calls to mind an entire tradition of anti-clerical caricatures, such as the doctor of divinity in *Piers Plowman* and Chaucer's monk. Further, its bodily excess – the bloated cheeks, hanging jowls, and amply draped vestments – provides a human mirror of the surrounding architectural excess. Similarly, the poetry remains in the same ekphrastic mode as the previous fifty lines – comparing the friar's body to inanimate objects and places (a barrel, a bag, a quagmire) and suggesting further that there is little difference between this image and those adorning the walls – both are excessively and carefully adorned, clean on the outside but empty and lifeless. After the narrator leaves the foundation and seeks the other orders, he comes to see that the religious establishment is more interested in maintaining its material holdings than in religious instruction of the laity.

Thus, material excess, as in other Lollard texts, is aligned with arrogance, vanity, and hypocrisy. But we cannot forget those sixty lines during which the well-meaning narrator has been seduced by images. The closest

thing to a critique of the building itself that we get is in the comparative asides, the lists of objects and materials, and the subtle reminders in the narrator's subsequent conversations with the friars that it is the donations and tithes of the laity on which the construction and upkeep of ecclesiastical edifices depend. Rather, the first half part of the poem models how aesthetic seduction and visual and verbal pleasure can distract from the pursuit of and representation of true or instructive signs.[67] But the narrator is not the only one in danger of being distracted by "sensible signes." The Lollard poet makes the reader complicit in this seduction, pulling out all the stops to beguile, seduce, and tempt the unsuspecting reader.

For this reason, it is not surprising that most scholarship on the *Crede* emphasizes the narrator's encounter with the friars; we have been seduced as well. But to focus exclusively on the first half is to linger on the poem's diagnosis of the problem rather than the formal remedy it wishes to provide: a figure who both knows and embodies the Creed. The second half opens with the disenchanted narrator mumbling to himself of the "falshede of this folk." But as he walks weeping, he is met by a very different sort of image:

> …a sely man me my opon the plow hongen.
> His cote was of a cloute that cary was y-called,
> His hod was full of holes, and his heer oute,
> With his knopped schon clouted full thykke;
> His ton toteden out as he the londe treddede,
> His hosen ouerhongen his hokschynes on eueriche a side,
> Al beslombred in fen as he the plow folwede;
> Twey myteynes, as mete, maad all of cloutes;
> The fyngers weren for-werd and ful of fen honged.
> This whit waselede in the fen almost to the ancle,
> Foure rotheren hym by-forn that feble were worthen;
> Men myghte reken ich a ryb so reufull they weren.
> His wijf walked him with with a longe gode,
> In a cutted cote cutted full heyghe,
> Wrapped in a wynwe schete to weren hire fro weders,
> Barfote on the bare ijs that the blode folwede.
> And at the londes ende laye a litell crom-bolle,
> And theron lay a litell childe lapped in cloutes,
> And tweyne of tweie yeres olde opon a-nother syde,
> And alle they songen o songe that sorwe was to heren;
> They crieden alle o cry a carefull note.
>
> (78–79/421–41)

This image clearly is meant to be a foil of the image of the friar. Where the friar represented pride, this man is the image of poverty. Where the friar

is externally clean, this man is "beslombred in fen." Where the friar was depicted as sitting static and statue-like on a bench, this man is captured in the process of his labor, bending over his plow. His clothing and mittens are made of rags, his hood contains so many holes that his hair pokes out, his shoes are stuffed with cloth, and his entire body is covered in the mud thrown up from the plow. His cows and his wife and children similarly bear the exterior marks of extreme poverty and hard labor.[68] Like the images of poverty in the *Lollard Sermons*, this humble description of the plowman (who will soon be named "Peres") and his family offers an alternative, living, "truer" image than the ones provided by the church.

Yet this description is also like the caricature of the Dominican friar insofar as it marks a striking contrast with the architectural grandeur depicted with such care in the earlier parts of the poem. As Scattergood notes, the description of Peres is "precise in a harrowingly graphic way," but it is also the "proverbial embodiment of poverty and indigence."[69] For many Lollard writers, the *only* true images are people, the *imagines dei*. And, insofar as this description is true, it both stands in opposition to and replaces the false images of the material church elaborated so carefully in the first part of the poem. The architectural images are a distraction (for both the reader and the narrator); the true images in the *Crede* are the poor.

Moreover, Peres, unlike any of the friars, is able and willing to teach the narrator how to read the sensory realm. He begins by laying bare the spiritual danger of aesthetic seduction. As Peres explains, the devil is very "queynte; / To encombren holy Churche he casteth ful hard, / And fluricheth his falsnes opon fele wise" (81/482–84). Peres' use of the ambiguous term "queynte" here marks a decided shift from the textual aesthetics of the first half of the poem. "Queynte," in its various forms, occurs eight times in the poem. In the first three instances it describes the beauty and elegance of the excessive forms being described: pillars are "queynteli icorven" (68/161); the chapter house is "queyntliche entayled" (70/200); the friars' coats are "queyntly y-botend" (74/296).[70] In the second part of the poem, however, the term is applied only to the duplicity of Satan and the friars:

> And in beldinge of tombes thei trauaileth grete
> To chargen her chirche-flore, and chaungen it ofte.
> And the fader of the freers defouled hir soules,
> That was the dygginge devel that dreccheth men ofte.
> The divill by his dotage dissaueth the chirche,
> And put in the prechours y-paynted withouten.

And by his queyntise they comen in the curates to helpen,
But that harmede hem harde and halp hem full litell.

<div align="right">(82/501–08)</div>

Peres thus explicitly aligns the artificiality, the shiny veneer of the friars
with the material structures that house them. They both are "queynte."
They both are "y-paynted withouten." The labor involved is also juxta-
posed against the labor of Peres. Like the whitewashed sepulchers con-
demned by Christ (Matthew, 23:37), the friars are compared to the soulless
buildings they have built and inhabit.[71] Like images, they are beautifully
but deceptively painted and adorned.

As the *Lollard Sermons* suggest, the association between image user
and image was a relatively common one in Lollard writing, which often
recalled the Psalmist's observation that all those "þat tristeþ in hem ben
maad like to hem; for þei han iȝen and seeþ noȝt, as þese ymagis han"
(114/312–13). The prologue to the *Wycliffite Bible* extends this type of com-
parison even further, equating corrupt clergy with idols:

a doumb prelate is an ydol, and not a very prelate; a doumb prelate is not a very
prelate sithen he vsith not the offis of a prelate, but he hath oonly the licnesse of
a prelate, as an ydol that vsith not the offis of a man is oonly lijk a man, but is
no man; therefore such doumbe prelatis moun riȝtfully be seid symylacris, either
ydolis.[72]

Just as material idols are deaf and "doumb," having eyes but unable to see
and ears but unable to hear, so too prelates are little more than "symy-
lacris." *The Lanterne of Liȝt* similarly describes the antichrist as an "ydole
hauyng a bischopis habit, but neiþir vertu ne spirit, lijf ne dede."[73] In the
Crede, these concepts are demonstrated by formal parallelisms rather than
explicit statements.

The juxtaposition of "goostli chirches" (the soul, the human being) and
"bodili chirches" (the material buildings) is also common in Lollard writ-
ings. In the *Dialogue Between Jon and Richard*, for example, Richard asks
Jon how to understand the value of "werkes of deuocioun, as making of
faire chirches, and ornamentis of hem."[74] Jon answers by emphasizing the
problem of material excess:

Soþ it is þat men schulde helpe þer parische chirche, but in mesure and reson as
God himself axeþ. For Crist preised not þe temple, but iuged it to be destroied.
But in eche place a clene soule is acceptable to him; and more excesse of clennes
is more accepted to God þanne excesse of cost of þe temple, be it neuer so
coynte. For God wiþouȝte mesure preised more deuocioun of soule þane any
erþley þing, be it neuer so costi, and herfore neiþer he ne his apostilis biside

hem for making of bodili chirches. Makynge of gostili chirches falleþ to Crist, and makyng of bodili chirches to lewed rewde men; so þat if chois of þese tuo were putte in a man, he schulde a þousandfolde more chese gostii chirches. For bodili chirche profitiþ not but in as myche as it serueþ and profitiþ to gostili chirche."[75]

Again we have the juxtaposition of dead images and living ones, and of "excesse of cost" with "excesse of clennes." Here as in so many Lollard texts, caring for a material edifice is contrasted with caring for a human being.[76] Donation of material ornaments to one's parish church, the author insists, is only problematic insofar as it displaces the attention that should be given to the "gostili chirche," or one's soul.[77] It is striking that this dialogue does not disparage ornamentation itself, but rather the ways in which it distracts attention from the inner life. As the author continues, he emphasizes that the material ornamentation of churches should remain inferior to the "ournamentis of vertues in a mannes soule."[78] Elsewhere in the *Dialogue*, Jon provides a detailed allegory of the soul as a cloister, enclosed and safeguarded by the spiritual walls of justice, strength, prudence, and temperance.[79] Although the tension between the material church and the spiritual church here is only one of degree, this author remains wary of the seduction of the senses, suggesting (through the voice of Richard) that "glorious houses and peynting of ymages fediþ of mennes eiȝen and spoules þer soules."[80]

As we have seen, the *Crede* author is also clearly concerned about the way that ocular seduction leads to spiritual corruption. Peres explains:

> For though a man in her mynster a masse wolde heren,
> His sight schal so be set on sundry werkes,
> The penounes and the pomels and poyntes of scheldes
> Withdrawen his deuocion, and dusken his herte.
>
> (84–85/560–63)

Here Peres juxtaposes seeing with hearing. Images (which may be "ill-made" or excessive) distract from the preaching of the word. As in the *Lollard Sermons*, the *Crede* insists that one's spiritual vision may be darkened and dulled by the sorts of things seen with the physical eyes. The aim of both the sermons and the *Crede* is nothing less than the reorientation and reformation of that vision. Like Hoccleve, as the next chapter will demonstrate, Lollard writers seek to provide textual spectacles – eyeglasses – that help their readers see better, that mediate material vision with truth-telling texts. Preacher and poet alike use descriptive language to help the blind learn to see.

Counted among the blind, for most Lollards, are the friars. Yet for all its condemnation of the friars, in the end we discover that the purpose of the *Crede* is not the rejection of the friars, but their reformation: "And for amending of thise men is most that I write" (97/838). Similarly, the final prayer surprisingly asks:

> God of his grete myghte and His good grace
> Saue all freres that faithfully lybben,
> And alle tho that ben fals fayre hem amende,
> And yiue hem wijt and good will swiche dedes to werche
> That thei maie wynnen the lif that euer schal lesten!
>
> (97/846–50)

Embedded in this final passage is the only adverbial use of "fayre" in the poem. Moreover, the term is tied by alliteration to its aesthetic and ethical opposite ("fals"). This alliterative association throws into relief the extent to which, as Elaine Scarry has argued, "an *ethical fairness* which requires 'a symmetry of everyone's relation' will be greatly assisted by an *aesthetic fairness* that creates in all participants a state of delight in their own lateralness."[81] Although such a formulation, now as then, represents an unrealizable aesthetic ideal, its reversal (quite appropriately) is remarkably in line with Lollard ideas about the ethics of form as represented in this passage: aesthetic fairness should be founded on ethical fairness.

The *Crede's* pun on "fayre" here recalls both the poem's lengthy descriptions of material fairness and the social unfairness on which it depends. As an adverb, the primary use of "faire" is "Of things seen or heard: (a) beautifully, splendidly, attractively, neatly; (b) brightly; (c) pleasantly, sweetly."[82] However, here the term seems to have a more ethical dimension; it may simply mean "appropriately" or "carefully," but it might equally well imply just or equitable conduct. The *Rosarium* engages directly with the polyvalence of the term: "seyng þe profete, 'Lorde, I haue luffed þe fayrnes of þis house.' Wiche fairnez? Noȝt wiche þe diuersite of schynyng marblez makeþ, but wiche þe variosnez or diuersenes of lyuyng gracez giffeþ."[83] Still, "fayre" is not a term used often in the *Crede*. Indeed, in its one other occurrence, it is in its adjectival form, describing the chambers of "fayre ladis" (94/769). Like his use of "queynte," the *Crede* author's play on the linguistic doubleness of this term suggests not iconoclasm, but rather an attempt to reclaim images and imagistic language for Lollard modes of reform, of "amending" the church by formal means.[84] If the poem's articulated ethical intent is reformist, its aesthetic goals seem to be nothing less than the reformation of alliterative poetry.

The refrain repeated over and over again in Lollard writing on images is that the poor are "þe ymage of God in a more liknesse þan þe stok or þe ston."[85] This conviction, as I hope the previous pages have suggested, not only undergirds and inflects much Lollard anti-image rhetoric, but also affects their literary practices. Lollard iconology is fundamentally a call for reform. It offers a vision of the world that first acknowledges that society often values things more than people and then offers a new vision for a society in which people are cared for more than things.

The "true" images venerated and cared for in this Lollard utopia are people. But this does not imply iconoclasm or a wholesale rejection of the material church. "The Plowman's Tale" suggests that

> To men and women that ben poore,
> That ben Christes owne lykenesse,
> Men shulden offre at her dore,
> That suffren honger and dystresse;
> And to suche ymages offre lesse,
> That mowe not fele thurst ne cold.[86]

Here again we have the suggestion of reorientation of vision and values: the author claims that people should offer *less* to material images than to living images. He notably does not suggest an outright rejection or neglect of the material church. Trial records from the last years of the fifteenth century make similar points. Richard Gilmyn asserted, for example, that "it is better to give money to the poor than to pay tithes to priests or to offer images of the Blessed Mary, and that it is better to offer to the created image of God than to a painted image of God."[87] *The Lanterne of Liȝt* inveighs more strongly against the vanity of clothing the church and leaving the poor naked: "þan as miche woden drem, þe chirche schynneþ in wowis; & sche nediþ in þe pore, sche wlappiþ hir stones in gold; & hir owene sones sche forsakiþ naked, of þe spensis of nedi is mad a veyn seruise; to riche mennes iȝen."[88] In the second half of the fifteenth century, the Lollard preacher William Taylor argued that excessive concern for material structures might lead to neglect of the "true" temple of God, human beings:

sum men anoon caren for susteynynge of greet bildyngis of tree and stoon, and recken not of þe susteynynge of þe hooly temple of God þys is man, þe which, glorified in body and soule, shal be euerlastynge tabernacle of God, for þe which to be repareilid Crist fro þe myddis of his herte shedde out his precious blood endelesly, lasse reckinge of sich costlew bilding.[89]

What these examples again imply is that for many Lollards, positions on material and visual culture are also always statements about justice and social fairness. Because humans, the created world, and the scriptures are the only divinely instituted representations of God, to devote money or veneration to objects crafted by humans to the neglect of living images is to commit idolatry.

If the poor are the other of material images, the morally upright Lollard preacher and the preached word also are preferable alternatives to the image. William Thorpe argues that if the teaching of Christ "weren made knowen to þe peple bi holi lyuyng, and trewe and bisie tehynge of preestis, þese þingis weren sufficient bokis and kalenders to knowe God bi and his seintis wiþouten ony ymage made wiþ mannes hond."[90] Preachers, Thorpe suggests, may serve as a more ethical alternative to visual *libri laicorum*. If the preacher "realises in his life the art of *recte vivendi*," as Kantik Ghosh has noted, he "becomes in effect a transparent mediator of God's Word."[91] Thus the virtuous Lollard preacher essentially replaces the function of the devotional image – reflecting, mediating, and teaching the word of God. The fundamental difference between the two, of course, is that preachers are the living image of God but also living and breathing *libri laicorum*. And preachers, as the *Lollard Sermons* remind us, teach the blind to see.

The final sermon in the *Lollard Sermons* concludes with a meditation on the "clere byholding" that will come in eternal life. This beholding, we discover, is the beholding of a book, specifically the "Book of Life" referenced in John's Apocalypse, and embodies the elusive *fairness* that many Lollards have been looking for all along:

> Þis boke makiþ man þat lokiþ þerinne so kunnyng of þe first day
> þat he knowiþ al clergy and kunnyng of craftis,
> and al wit haþe at his wille of what he wole desire.
> Alle myraclis and merueylis, þe most þat euer God made,
> whiche were wonderful to her wit while þei wandrid her,
> shal be to hem liȝt ynow þat loken on þis book.
> Þe lewidest knaue of þe kychyn here shal be þere clerke,
> and take dignite of degre in dyuinite
> at þe first lesson þat he lokiþ in þis boke,
> when alle deynous doctouris shullen drawe þere abacke,
> þat now letten suche lewid men to lerne here Lordis lawe.
> For what persoone þat plesiþ God most perfitly in þis worlde –
> be he clerke, knyȝt, or knaue – when he þider comyþ,
> shal be most made of and next þe mageste.
> Þis boke shal neuer be clasped vp, ne closid in no cloyster,

but as opun to one as to anoþer, for þat is oure Lordis ordre.
Þis boke is so briȝt and so breme to hem alle
þat he nediþ neuer oþer liȝt of launterne ne of laumpe,
as large as þe plase is, to loke in her lesson.
Þe louely loking on her lesson shal like hem so wel
þat þei shal euer wake and neuer winke, wiþouten ony werines,
and euer fast wiþouten feding of ony worldly fode,
for þe feire siȝt of his face shal fully feest hem alle.

(240/1139–64)[92]

This is a theologically adventurous rewriting of the beatific vision, but notably one that does not entirely eliminate worldly distinctions. Strikingly, the eschatological vision of the Lollards is one of textual and visual satisfaction. It is democratic – all can read and gaze equally.[93] Indeed, its emphasis on the breakdown of clerical hegemony, its insistence on the "openness" of the book, and unmediated relation with God might be read as a moment of Lollard wish-fulfillment. But more importantly, the passage models Lollard aesthetic values. Pleasure and delight derive from both beauty and justice. They are located in a "briȝt" and "breme" book; readers engage in "louely loking"; God's face is "feire." Moreover, the alliterative patterns of the sermon itself produce sensory pleasure. The Lollard desire for "fayreness" thus finds its fulfillment in this utopian vision of textual community where learning is no longer labor but rather "louely loking" and visual desire – long seduced by material fairness – is satisfied by "þe feire siȝt of his face [that] shal fully feest hem alle."

Thomas Hoccleve's spectacles

The manner of seeing decides what can be seen, or, at least negatively, decides what can not be perceived of the divine.

<div align="right">Jean-Luc Marion[1]</div>

When Thomas Hoccleve addresses the relationship between images and texts he begins with the eyes. He emphasizes that, on the most basic level, reading and writing rely on seeing. After decades of copying texts, medieval clerics often faced spending their final years with ruined vision and a diminished capacity for continued scribal work. Unsurprisingly, the strain of such work on the eyes was a common grievance of professional copyists. One cleric gripes that "writing weighs one down. It brings dimness to your eyes, curves your spine, twists your ribs and your stomach, sends pain shooting through your kidneys," and so on.[2] Hoccleve, a lifelong bureaucrat and Privy Seal scribe, was also intimately acquainted with the ocular effects of textual labor:

> What man that three and twenti yeer and more
> In wrytynge hath continued, as have I,
> I dar wel seyn, it smertith him ful sore
> In every veyne and place of his body;
> And yen moost it greeveth, treewely,
> Of any craft that man can ymagyne.
> Fadir, in feith, it spilt hath wel ny myne.[3]

His body bears the marks of his scribal work. As he explains, hours of staring "upon the sheepes skyn" lead to an aching back, an upset stomach, and, most notably, ruined eyesight.[4] But by the early fifteenth century, the last complaint had a remedy; many scribes were making use of a new optical technology – spectacles. Although it remains difficult to pin down when and by whom eyeglasses were invented, they had become widely used in Italy by the beginning of the fourteenth century and had certainly arrived in England by the early fifteenth.[5] Eyeglasses also begin

to appear in manuscript miniatures and other images throughout Europe in the mid fourteenth century. Usually associated with scribal labor in these images, spectacles rest beside other writerly accoutrements on the desk of a scriptorium, dangle in cases from the belts of scribes, and (rather anachronistically) adorn the countenances of early writers, including Jerome, Augustine, and even the apostles.[6]

Despite their increasing use, spectacles seem to have carried something of a social stigma. Hoccleve confesses in a ballade to the Duke of York that he is too proud to wear them: "pryde is vn-to me so greet a fo, / Þat the spectacle forbedith he me, / And hath y-doon of tyme yore ago."[7] Such reluctance to use visual correctives was not unique to Hoccleve (indeed, Petrarch admits a similar aversion[8]), but for Hoccleve this physical vanity has literary ramifications. Since his "sighte blyue hastith" from him, he argues, it should be no surprise that his poem should "haue no beautee." In other words, Hoccleve represents poetic dullness as tied to the scribe's inability to see clearly.[9] To this end, he concludes with a reprimand to his pride, claiming that it has damaged his vision ("my sighte is hurt") in refusing him the visual aid he needs for his scribal and poetic labor.

Given these circumstances, it is telling that the limitations of vision and the technologies used to correct sight are central themes in Hoccleve's poetic corpus and frequently evoked in his discussions of heresy and the proper function of religious images. On the one hand, eyeglasses represent an undesirable but necessary visual aid for Hoccleve; they are a corrective for faulty *visio corporalis*. They are a means of regulating, correcting, and supplementing the body. Were he to wear them, they would mediate his failing corporeal vision. On the other, Hoccleve exploits the figurative potential of eyeglasses (and other visual aids) to explore the media that govern the acquisition of knowledge and the workings of *visio spiritualis*. Seeing has, after all, long been equated with knowing.[10] Discourses of visual and visionary experience are inextricably knotted.[11] Moreover, as Katherine Tachau suggests, any consideration of vision reveals "the inseverable ties binding psychology, epistemology, and semantics."[12] For Hoccleve, as for many of his contemporaries, the faculty of sight is the juncture of the metaphysical and the concrete, of the spiritual and the physical, but also of the personal and the social. Yet Hoccleve writes verse that questions these relations. He offers his own deteriorating corporeal vision as the means of exploring the relationships between physical and metaphysical forms of seeing, between the viewing subject and perceived object, and between visual mediation and literary production.

But Hoccleve's concern with impaired vision is not limited to his own experience. He maps anxiety about deteriorating social vision onto his own deteriorating vision and articulates the necessity for mediation and correction. Running parallel to Hoccleve's fear of his own physical decline is a subtle but persistent narrative of social decay, religious vulnerability, and spiritual blindness. Hoccleve's writing often articulates an anxiety about the blinding power of heresy.[13] The "inward ye" of the heterodox, he explains, "is ful of smoke & reeke."[14] They look amiss, their "sighte is nothing cleer" *(RO,* 83). Hoccleve is afraid that, if not controlled, the errors that have blinded the followers of this "false secte" will obscure the vision of others.[15] His solution to such threats is to emphasize the importance of mediating and regulating social, intellectual, and spiritual vision.

This chapter analyzes the relationships among optics, epistemology, heresy, and the use of religious images in Hoccleve's writings. Throughout his poetry, Hoccleve implies that perception is always hindered by the impaired vision of the viewer and thus in need of mediating forms. Spectacles, as I have already suggested, offer Hoccleve a unique metaphor for considering the relationship between the subject's ability to perceive an object and the object's power to transform the gazing subject.[16] Like the Lollard texts we considered in the last chapter, many of Hoccleve's poems query both the image and its respondents and ultimately use language to correct his readers' vision. Thus, his writing becomes a set of textual spectacles insofar as it seeks to bring images into clearer focus.

The chapter is divided into two halves – the first addresses the roles that optical discourses and media play in Hoccleve's defense of religious images; the second explores the limitations of the human reception and right interpretation of images. I first take up Hoccleve's defenses of images in *The Regiment of Princes* and *The Remonstrance Against Oldcastle* and show how Hoccleve appropriates the discourses and technologies of vision to frame his consideration of religious images but also to explore the development of the problematics of what he calls "unsighte." In the second half of the chapter, I argue first that Hoccleve's *Complaint* and *Dialogue* (1420–21) reveal the maturing poet's interest in the effects of a skeptical, post-perspectivist model of vision that emphasizes the interpretive and constitutive agency of the viewer. I turn next to Hoccleve's translation of the *ars moriendi* section of Suso's *Horologium*, which models the limitations of both the mediatory image and vision itself. In this translation, we see the reciprocity of the medieval gaze at work as the narrator produces, enters into dialogue with, and ultimately is transformed by an

image. The physical act of seeing (or inability to see), and in particular the physical means by which one's sight might be corrected or improved, come to serve as central analogies for Hoccleve's diagnosis of both his own epistemological uncertainty and the conflicted religious climate of the first few decades of the fifteenth century. In sum, in Hoccleve's corpus (both physical and poetic) we see the seeds of late medieval tensions between the dominant ocular epistemologies – ways of knowing rooted in seeing – and an emerging speculative poetics – ways of knowing that both focus on the image and are suspicious of it and that are ultimately mediated by texts.

OPTICS, ORTHODOXY, AND THE DEFENSE OF IMAGES IN *THE REGIMENT OF PRINCES* AND *THE REMONSTRANCE AGAINST OLDCASTLE*

Although his poetic corpus contains a number of devotional lyrics and religious polemics, Hoccleve is rarely considered a "religious" poet.[17] He does, however, often position himself as an opponent of heresy – wielding his pen in defense of Lancastrian orthodoxy in works such as *The Remonstrance Against Oldcastle*, a versified effort to shame the elusive Sir John Oldcastle out of hiding and heresy, and composing a number of devotional lyrics geared toward generating sympathetic identification.[18] Throughout the *Remonstrance* and his corpus more generally, hiding and heresy serve as linchpins for a broader, and decidedly more ambivalent, consideration of what Hoccleve elsewhere defines as "unsighte" – a Hocclevian neologism that evokes a constellation of visual negations: the absence of images, figurative blindness, hiddenness, and invisibility.[19]

Hoccleve's entrance into the debates about heresy in general, and the question of images in particular, has often been read as straightforwardly orthodox.[20] It is certainly the case that Hoccleve's insistence on his own orthodoxy is a frequent motif in his corpus. As Paul Strohm has influentially argued, the poet "bends the energies of his text to an assertion of the representational divide that the Lancastrians themselves were intent on driving between seeming and being, outer and inner, counterfeit and real, material and ineffable, heretical and orthodox, illegitimate and legitimate." Even so, Strohm continues, Hoccleve's corpus "everywhere announces its preference for the orthodox and the legitimate in their struggle against adulteration."[21] But as Ethan Knapp and Andrew Cole have shown, the story is rather more muddled and ambivalent than Strohm's version of it might suggest.[22] In fact, Hoccleve's use of this

divisive language is characterized more often by hesitance and ambiguity than by Lancastrian confidence.

I would like to suggest that rather than simply assert these representational binaries, Hoccleve seeks to understand the proper forms of mediating the extremes. How does one distinguish, he asks, between what seems to be and what actually is? Between sensing and knowing? Between form and substance? Between the legitimate and illegitimate? These questions are central to his understanding of what is at issue in the role of devotional images in lay religious practice. In his considerations of religious images, Hoccleve adamantly emphasizes the importance of bridging the representational divide. In this section I examine the ways in which Hoccleve draws on the linguistic and theological resources of optical discourses to negotiate the complexities of these issues.

Hoccleve's *Regiment of Princes* (1412) shows the poet to be very interested in the mirroring structures of textual *exempla*, but it is only at the end of the prince's advice book and only after supplying a series of textual mirrors that Hoccleve addresses visual *exempla*.[23] In one of the most commented-upon passages in the poem, Hoccleve appeals to the example of his "worthy maistir," Chaucer, and supplies a visual image of the dead poet in the margins of the manuscript so that those "that han of him lost thoght and mynde / By this peynture may ageyn him fynde" (*RP*, 4997–98).[24] But Hoccleve does not linger on this image. He quickly turns to a consideration of the uses of religious images more generally. Many scholars have been puzzled by the hasty transition from the "secular" image of the poet to the "religious" images of the following stanzas.[25] Yet the assumed secularity of Chaucer's portrait (it has been called a secular "icon of national identity" and "a secular object of devotion") is not supported by the lines of verse that accompany it.[26] In the preceding text, Hoccleve characterizes Chaucer as a devotee and servant of Mary, who "With lovyng herte and hy devocioun / In [her] honour he wroot ful many a lyne" (*RP*, 4986–87). This representation is closer to that of the pious Chaucer of the Retraction of the *Canterbury Tales* than to the bawdy bard as we know him today.

The accompanying image found in two of the manuscripts of the *Regiment* corroborates this description: the elderly poet is robed in black and holds a rosary in one hand while pointing to the text of the poem with the other. This image is, in Ruth Nissé's term, "quasi-religious," if not fully devotional.[27] Like that of a saint, it is memorial and perhaps exemplary. And as others have added, Hoccleve encourages the reader to view it with the same sort of devotion one would direct toward a

representation of a saint.[28] Hoccleve himself certainly reads it this way. He explains that although Chaucer is dead, "the resemblance / Of him hath in me so fressh lyflynesse" that he will reproduce it for his readers (*RP*, 4992–93). This marginal image is hence active and, in some sense, *alive*. It vivifies Chaucer. Further, it affects and acts upon and in Hoccleve, incarnating Chaucer within Hoccleve. But however lifelike it may be, the image cannot convey this vivacity on its own; it needs the accompanying verse. "Remembrance" of Chaucer is engendered by the reciprocity of image and text.[29] They mirror each other – the image calls attention to the text, the text directs the reader back to the image. Moreover, the effect of this "imagetext" is not simply memorial; it generates an affective, transformative encounter.[30]

This reading is borne out by the subsequent characterization of the agency of religious images in the following two stanzas, and supported by medieval optical models, which insisted on the reciprocity of the gaze. Immediately after his textual gesture toward the marginal icon of Chaucer, Hoccleve addresses the use and reception of religious images more generally:

> The ymages that in the chirches been,
> Maken folk thynke on God and on his seintes,
> Whan the ymages they beholde and seen;
> Where ofte unsighte of hem causith restreyntes
> Of thoghtes goode. Whan a thyng depeynt is
> Or entaillid, if men take of it heede,
> Thoght of the liknesse, it wole in hem breede.
>
> Yit sum men holde oppinioun and seye
> That noon ymages sholde ymakid be.
> They erren foule and goon out of the weye;
> Of trouthe have they scant sensibilitee.
>
> (*RP*, 4999–5009)

Hoccleve here offers the first of his poetic defenses of religious images. These stanzas concisely articulate the themes that will emerge in most of his other considerations of the value of visual representation. At first glance, there is little surprising about this description of the workings and reception of images. Hoccleve's verse reproduces one of the most traditional apologetics for images: that an image is ontologically different from its prototype. Images, Hoccleve insists, are signs. They enable reflection on the saints that they depict. External, corporeal sight of an image is translated into internal sight, since "if men take … heede" of an image, "it wole *in hem* breede" (grow or reproduce) not only noble thoughts but also a deeper spiritual understanding of the likeness the image represents.

Hoccleve's logic here is indebted to medieval theories of the imagination but also builds on medieval optical theory, which suggests that images, when viewed correctly, are translated from physical image to spiritual image in the viewer's imagination and intellect.[31] The two central optical models throughout the Middle Ages differ on where to locate the agency in the process of seeing. The first, intromission, emphasizes the agency of the object. In this model the "viewer" is the passive recipient of the image, which is transmitted by the object. The second, extramission, emphasizes the agency of the viewer, who actively sends out a visual beam to apprehend the object. Both models presuppose a reciprocity between object and subject.[32] As Suzanne Akbari puts it, "for the subject to know the object, the two must come into contact: the object must come to be, in some way, inside the subject."[33] Since common sense showed that the object could not enter into the subject in any physical way, medieval optical scholars suggested that the object was transmitted via immaterial representations, which were also called forms or species.

While these basic elements of optical theory are evident in discussions of vision in early Greek philosophy and remain central to later debates, they were often in competition. Alhazan, the eleventh-century Arab physicist whose *Optica* arrived in the Latin West in the thirteenth century, suggested, contra the period's widely accepted extramission theory, that light is emitted from objects, yet that the eyes are not merely receptacles of images seen, but rather optical instruments that form images from the light that enters them.[34] Thus, for Alhazan, perception was a self-conscious act. The other important influence on early optical theory in England was Robert Grosseteste, who adopted the extramission theory.[35] Grosseteste considered light both ontologically and epistemologically – fusing vision with cognition.[36] Yet he also acknowledged the limitations of such an equation. As Bruce Eastwood comments, for Grosseteste, "true knowledge depends on the divine light [but] man normally finds his spiritual 'vision' beclouded and is unable to perceive truth directly … our senses are required for knowledge only because of original sin."[37] Grosseteste believed that, because of the close relation between the study of physical light and of divine light, the study of optics leads toward spiritual vision, and thus, physical perception, though distorted by original sin, is a path to knowledge of the divine. In other words, for Grosseteste, "Geometrical optics is *in se* a form of *sapientia*."[38] For this reason, Grosseteste's most important contribution was arguably his role in the transformation of optics into the fundamental realm of scientific inquiry and in the spread of the equation of optics and epistemology.[39]

The optics of Alhazan and Grosseteste influenced the philosophical optics of thirteenth-century natural philosophers such as Roger Bacon (1220–92), John Pecham (*c.* 1235–92), and Witelo (*c.* 1235–*c.* 1275), collectively known as "perspectivists."[40] Bacon's primary contribution was the synthesis of the two traditions; his theory incorporated Alhazan's intromission with Grosseteste's extramission into a theory of the multiplication of species.[41] Bacon suggested that vision relied on a reciprocal relationship between seer and seen, that "the eye was simultaneously receptive, passive, vulnerable to sensations; and active: roaming, grasping or piercing its objects. Sight was at once an extension of the sensitive soul towards an object, and the passage of sensible forms through the eye and into the brain."[42] For Bacon, visible objects emit light and color into and through a transparent medium and are impressed on the eye of the viewer. This impression upon the eye, understood as another clear medium, enables the division between inner and outer to be transgressed, and the species are received into the region of the inner senses, consequently translating the act of physical perception into one of psychological perception. Thus, the process of apprehension of a seen object demands both the external, physical impression of a visual object upon the eye of the viewer and the interpretation of that impression by the interior faculties of the soul.[43]

The reciprocity of Bacon's synthesis underlies Hoccleve's representation of how images function. In Hoccleve's account, the viewer actively beholds the image and the image, in effect, gazes back. Because of the reciprocity of this interaction, the image actually changes its viewer, assimilating him or her to itself, or in Hoccleve's words, "Thoght of the liknesse, it wole in hem breede." Transformation is effected by the incarnation and growth of the devotional image inside its viewer. But this transformation is contingent on the receptivity of the viewer. It is not enough to have images "depeynt … Or entaillid," if viewers are not taking "heede" of them. Merely looking and receiving visual data is insufficient. Right vision demands engagement; seeing requires that one be both a passive receiver and an active reader of images. As Suzannah Biernoff has shown, in this reciprocal visual encounter, "the viewer could expect to be transformed, but so too was God."[44] When one meditates on images of God, God is again incarnated and identifies intimately with the human viewer. In other words, what naturally follows from the application of a perspectivist model to devotional images is the late medieval emphasis on the humanity of Christ.[45] Thus, devotional images are powerful, Hoccleve implies, not primarily because of their mnemonic, exemplary,

or pedagogical usefulness, but rather because they, like the Eucharist, enact a transformation in the willing recipient.

An even more striking element of Hoccleve's apologetic is that he sees the converse of this visual assimilation as equally true: "unsighte" of these images actually prevents spiritual and moral transformation. As Hoccleve employs the term, there is a causal relationship between inability or refusal to see and spiritual action. Just as Chaucer's "resemblance" instills "fressh lyflynesse" in the poet, "unsighte" of images "causith restreyntes / Of thoghtes goode." That is to say, Hoccleve figures both material absence and blindness here as detrimental to the soul. If vision is transformative insofar as it reproduces on the "inner eye" the virtuous things perceived by the outer eyes, blindness (or a lack of images) imprints absence on the mind. In a helpful essay, Ruth Nissé has suggested that Hoccleve's addition of what may happen when an image is not seen "adds an unusual epistemological twist to the doctrine of image and prototype."[46] Although Nissé reads this refusal or inability to see as effectively an "internal censorship of English poetry" regulated by a new, politically motivated literary orthodoxy,[47] it might also be read in light of contemporary optical discourses, which, as I have suggested, understood a continuity between external and internal vision, between seeing and knowing. Additionally, the absence of images in churches, Hoccleve asserts in this mirror-image rebuttal of Lollard polemics, is spiritually dangerous.

In the second stanza of the apologetic, Hoccleve addresses these dissenters, concluding with a direct accusation against those who might disagree with his position:

> Yit sum men holde oppinioun and seye
> That noon ymages sholde ymakid be.
> They erren foule and goon out of the weye;
> Of trouthe have they scant sensibilitee.
>
> (*RP*, 5006–09)

A word that highlights the close connections between physical and metaphysical knowledge, implying both a mode of cognitive perception and a mode of physical perception, the "sensibilitee" of late medieval religion was frequently condemned by its Lollard critics.[48] As we saw in the previous chapter, Lollard writings are saturated with cautionary rhetoric calling attention to the dangers of "sense," from admonitions to beware of "sensible signes" to discussions of the superiority of the incorporeal to the sensible. As one Lollard writer succinctly puts it, "we schulden knowe bi resoun that thingis that ben unsensible passen in goodnesse thingis that

ben sensible."[49] Here and elsewhere, Lollard writers claim reason as the interpretive lens for understanding the relationship between the sensible and the "unsensible."

However, earlier in the *Regiment* Hoccleve argues that reason is neither an accurate nor an authoritative mediator of experience and knowledge. Moreover, he accuses the Lollards of placing too much emphasis on it to support their heterodox opinions: "For mannes reson may nat preeve our fey / That they wole it dispreeven or denye" (*RP*, 332–33). Instead, Hoccleve claims that the authority of the church and its traditions alone should mediate and regulate the interpretation of sensory data:

> Our feith nat were unto us meritorie
> If that we mighten by reson it preeve.
> Lat us nat fro God twynnen and His glorie;
> As Holy Chirche us bit, lat us byleeve.
> But we therto obeye, it shal us greeve
> Importably; lat us do as shee bit;
> Oure goode fadres olde han folwed it.
>
> (*RP*, 351–57)

In the matters of faith, Hoccleve advocates tradition as the key to the regulation of signs. Such appeals to tradition and narratives of succession, as Paul Strohm has argued, are often attempts to stabilize the sign.[50] But it is important to note that it is not the indeterminacy of the sign that Hoccleve seems to fear in his apologetic for images in the *Regiment*, but rather the inability of those who perceive signs to interpret them accurately. Although the image has a certain agency of its own, for Hoccleve, there is no excuse for human "unsighte" – either in the removal of images from public places or in the blindness of viewers.

Hoccleve's interest in questions of "unsighte" and of proper perception are even more explicit in his defense of images in his *Remonstrance against Oldcastle*, a shorter poem written only a few years after the completion of the *Regiment*. In the *Remonstrance* Hoccleve draws upon contemporary rhetorics and technologies of vision to reconsider the epistemological reliability and transformative power of religious images in a world in which the inner eye of reason is obscured by sin. As many scholars have noted, the heretical Sir John Oldcastle (who stands in for heretics more generally in the poem) is characterized by hiddenness, absence, and darkness. Knapp has observed that "the central ideological division in the poem, the distinction between orthodoxy and heresy, is presented through a contrast between the seen and unseen."[51] Strohm similarly sees Oldcastle as

"an absence who, endlessly written about, still eludes his representations."[52] Oldcastle's intractable refusal to come out of hiding after escaping from imprisonment in the tower of London in 1413 provides Hoccleve with a set of metaphors for his poem.[53] Hoccleve contrasts light and darkness throughout the poem, in reference to both Oldcastle's physical hiddenness and the state of his soul. The heretic has moved, the opening stanzas claim, "Fro light of trouthe vn-to dirke falsnesse" (*RO*, 24). Later, Hoccleve accuses the recluse of blindness, saying "Thow lookist mis, thy sighte is nothyng cleer" (*RO*, 83) and exclaiming "Oldcastel how hath the feend thee blent!" (*RO*, 97). As in the *Regiment*, Hoccleve here equates heresy with senselessness, hiddenness, and ultimately with spiritual blindness.

Hoccleve thus represents the heretic in the same terms used by many Lollard writers to describe the idol. Knapp and others have read Hoccleve's representation of Oldcastle as that of an "exemplary antisaint designed to refute Lollard doctrine in both substance and representational strategy."[54] Yet Hoccleve carries this association one step further, appropriating and inverting a common rhetorical move of Lollard writers, who (drawing on Psalm 113) emphasized the assimilatory power of the idol, suggesting that all "þat tristeþ in hem ben maad like to hem; for þei han iȝen and seeþ noȝt, as þese ymagis han, for þei seen wel wiþ hire bodili iȝen of wham þei ben maad, and of what metal, and ȝet þei beþ blyndid in hire gostli iȝen."[55] Apologists for images often used the first part of the Psalm to distinguish Christian images from pagan idols, but rarely discussed the psalmist's final assertion of the influence of the created object on its creator. Idols, Lollards claimed, are merely wood or stone. They thus neither see nor hear but are animated by demonic presence.[56] Hoccleve's description of Oldcastle as "enhabited with Sathanas" (*RO*, 280) and as blind and silent suggests both an awareness of the Lollard argument and an attempt to invert it for his own purposes. Oldcastle, he suggests in this subtle rhetorical move, is paradoxically as impotent and as dangerous as the pagan idol.

Moreover, like the "unsighte" of images in the *Regiment*, the hiddenness of Oldcastle has religious implications. In the lines leading up to his justification of the use of images, Hoccleve further emphasizes the disjunction between the image of Oldcastle and images of saints. Responding to Oldcastle's rejection of the making of images, Hoccleve asks: "How can yee, by reson yourself excuse / Þat yee nat erren, whan yee folk excite / To vice, and stire hem, virtue to refuse?" (*RO*, 397–99). Hoccleve's language mirrors that of his discussions of the affective power of devotional images. Indeed, only a dozen lines later, as we will see, he praises religious images

for stirring virtuous thoughts. Oldcastle's image is exemplary. His fall into heresy serves as a negative model for other "folk." But the absent Oldcastle also comes to embody the troubling power of "unsighte." Like orthodox images, heterodox ones are transformative. Even when (or perhaps especially when) absent or hidden, they can lead others into idolatry.

Yet Hoccleve does not merely imply that heretics are like idolatrous images. He also uses this opportunity to clarify the role of images of saints:

> And to holde ageyn ymages makynge,
> (Be they maad in entaille or in peynture,)
> Is greet errour for they yeuen stirynge
> Of thoghtes goode and causen men honure
> The seint after whom maad is that figure,
> And nat worsshippe it how gay it be wrought.
> For this knowith wel euery creature
> Þat reson hath þat a seint is it noght.
>
> (*RO*, 409–16)

The apologetic offered here is traditional enough: images are useful for stirring pious thoughts and enabling the viewer to remember and honor the saint depicted. The assimilatory power of the image emphasized in the *Regiment*'s apologetic is absent here, replaced with the slightly less provocative "stirynge" of good thoughts. Hoccleve is also careful to emphasize the conventional distinction between *dulia* ("honure") and *latria* ("worsshippe"). Those using this distinction maintained that different objects or persons demand different types of veneration: one worships God with the highest form of adoration, or *latria*, but one honors fellow humans with *dulia*, or in special cases (as in the veneration of Mary), *hyperdulia*. In either case, however, the agency is given almost entirely to the viewer of the image. Even while emphasizing the reception of the image, Hoccleve's apologetic here, as in the *Regiment*, relies on visual reciprocity. The images "yeuen stirynge" and "causen" people to honor the saints they depict. The passage begins, in other words, by emphasizing the activity and agency of the images. Images are more than memorial signs. They merit veneration, not because of their external form ("how gay it be wroght"), but because they direct the viewer's gaze to the transcendent being, which cannot be limited to pictorial representation but is suggested (if not necessarily represented) by its sensible sign. But images, like pilgrimages, are only "ful goode if þat folk wel hem vse" (*RO*, 394). This is an essential point for Hoccleve. The value of images and other "sensible signes" is determined by the way humans understand and use

them. Proper use, in this case, means distinguishing between *latria* and *dulia* and only giving images the honor that they are due.

It must be acknowledged, though, that many Lollards drew little distinction between *latria* and *dulia*, condemning both equally. Instead, they were concerned that lifeless images were worshipped or venerated in memory of the absent saint as if they were the actual person represented. Hoccleve's response to this concern is simply a flippant dismissal of the foolishness of anyone who can believe that an image is the saint itself. The image, he writes, is not the subject of worship, but rather a sign that enables memory of the absent saint. It is merely a "figure," not the saint itself. He ends the stanza with a note of exasperation and incredulity at the semiotic doltishness of those who claim the material image itself is the object of worship, writing, "For this knowith wel euery creature / Þat reson hath þat a seint is it noght." Although he had argued for the limits of reason in matters of faith in the early stanzas of the poem and in the *Regiment* ("Our feith nat were unto us meritorie / If that we mighten by reson it preeve," *RP*, 351–52), here he reintroduces "reson," equating it with right interpretation.

Hoccleve follows the traditional apologetic for images in the above stanza with a strikingly unconventional metaphor to explain how images stir virtuous thoughts: spectacles. While what is seen and what is unseen are central themes of the poem, Hoccleve's metaphorical use of eyeglasses to clarify how religious images function obscures any simple distinction between vision and blindness and light and darkness:

> Right as a spectacle helpith feeble sighte,
> Whan a man on the book redith or writ,
> And causith him to see bet than he mighte,
> In which spectacle his sighte nat abit,
> But gooth thurgh & on the book restith it;
> The same may men of ymages seye,
> Thogh the ymage nat the seint be yit
> The sighte vs myngith to the seint to preye.
>
> (*RO*, 417–24)

Drawing on the poetic and apologetic potential of contemporary technologies of vision, Hoccleve here suggests that religious images function like eyeglasses, which enhance the perception of those with failing vision. They are material means of apprehending spiritual realities that cannot be seen by the physical eye. Again, Hoccleve's basic point is similar to that made in the earlier defense: power does not lie in the image itself, only in the prototype brought to mind by the image. However, his causal

language again suggests that the object retains limited agency. While eyeglasses "helpith" and "causith," they are ultimately only an intermediary form. Their helpfulness depends on their user (as Hoccleve's own reluctance to wear eyeglasses reminds us). The viewer's gaze in this account is significantly more active and thus suggestively extramissionist; the direction of the ray of vision is outward, moving from the viewer's eyes to the image and through it to that which must elude representation. Hoccleve's defense of religious images is rooted in the assumption that the viewing subject has literate and active eyes and that the viewer knows how to and is willing to perceive in the sense of *perspicere*, "to see through." Thus, the emphasis differs somewhat from that of his apologetic in the *Regiment*. While not explicitly denying the transformative power of the image, Hoccleve offers another approach to image use based on a slightly more extramissionist optical model. The effect of this shift is first, as I have already mentioned, to assert the agency of the viewing subject, and second, to highlight the mediatory function of religious images.

Paradoxically, in this defense, Hoccleve ascribes less power and agency to images than the heterodox critics of images do.[57] While acknowledging that images might help and stir the feelings of their viewers, for Hoccleve, the onus of their interpretation lies on their human viewer. Any rational human being, Hoccleve insists, will not mistake the seeming vivacity of objects with reality. As we have seen, Lollard writings on images and pilgrimages often articulate a similar concern about the reception of images, but demonstrate less confidence in their human interpreters. Since images are only likenesses, one Lollard author continues, it is wrong to pray to "þe swete rode of Bromholme" or "oure dere Lauedy of Walsyngham" rather than directly to Christ or Mary.[58]

Unlike the Lollard concern about the culpability of viewers who confuse corporeal images with the incorporeal beings they signify, Hoccleve's use of optical metaphors implies clarity of vision. But, as we will see, elsewhere he expresses ambivalence not about the inherent clarity or lack of clarity of what is signified, but rather about the viewer's ability to see clearly and accurately. Instead of positing a hermeneutic framework for the interpretation of signs in response to this problem of seeing, Hoccleve rejects the human ability to determine meaning through unmediated reason. Human vision, he suggests throughout his corpus, is fundamentally impaired and needs lenses, which "causith [a person] to see bet than he mighte." Knapp suggests that here eyeglasses "function by offering a level of apparent perception that is actually not a thing-in-itself but a level of pure mediation."[59] In other words, the experience of the divine offered

by a religious image, Hoccleve argues, is fundamentally a mediated experience. The image, like a pair of spectacles, is a form that mediates between physical and spiritual sight. Yet the image itself is also subject to another level of mediation. Because human vision and reason are blinded by original sin and cannot perceive clearly, they need the mediation of the church, another set of spectacles that make visible what is unclear to reason alone.

The final stanzas of the poem return to the question of spiritual visibility. Hoccleve prays that God might show his face to Oldcastle – "Almighty god byseeche I of his grace / Enable yow to seen his blessid face" (*RO*, 484–85) – and thus turn him from error. However, it is Oldcastle's own invisibility that inhibits this spiritual sight. Knowledge of God, Hoccleve suggests, is only made manifest by human visibility, but "thow hydest thee / And darst nat come & shewe thy visage" (*RO*, 501–02). The face of God, rendered visible by the "spectacles" of religious images and the humble acceptance of church doctrine, is thus contrasted with the visage of Oldcastle, which remains dark and hidden by pride.

SEEING AND BEING SEEN IN THE *COMPLAINT* AND *DIALOGUE*

It is Hoccleve's own face that resists visibility in the *Series*, a verse compilation written five to six years after the *Remonstrance*. Emphasizing the passivity of being seen, as opposed to the activity of seeing, the *Series* insists that, first and foremost, images are not only interpreted, but also constituted, by the gaze of their viewer. The *Series* explores the social and theological implications of vision and visibility. In the opening sections, Hoccleve dwells on the social perception of his once-mad but now-recovered body, but also contrasts human voyeurism with the divine gaze. In "How to Learn to Die," which I read as the thematic hub of the *Series*, Hoccleve explores the theological dimensions of visibility, suggesting that the interpretation of sensible forms is contingent upon an acknowledgement of their external constitution by a divine gaze. In short, the *Series* represents the interactions between images (textual and visual, living and dead) and the human and divine gazes that see them, with Hoccleve's own body transformed into the central image of the compilation.

However, this emphasis on visibility is complicated by the poem's often acknowledged obsession with textuality, by its emphasis on the process of writing and the scribal labor of reading and translating. As many scholars have noted, the poem is self-consciously the product of Hoccleve's bureaucratic setting.[60] Yet in the end, literary and bureaucratic attempts to

translate sensible images, Hoccleve implies, reveal the limitations of the scribal gaze. Hoccleve represents his entrance into these intersecting traditions as an intensely personal and somewhat dangerous affair. His concern with perception, his *Series* initially suggests, is primarily the effect of his anxiety about how he is being perceived by those around him as he recovers from mental illness. Throughout the poem, he struggles to set forth an ordered exterior self-image to assure himself and those around him that his mind, which he claims had temporarily "gone on pilgrimage," has returned again.

The unity of the *Series* (a title given to the compilation by Eleanor Hammond only in 1927) is complicated by its form.[61] The compilation consists of five poems linked by a purportedly autobiographical frame in which the author-narrator relates the occasion for writing by describing his recovery from a period of madness and social alienation. The opening two poems chronicle the author's personal narrative, first through the genre of solitary complaint and again through a dialogue with a visiting friend.[62] The latter three poems are translations of two stories from the *Gesta Romanorum* with prose moralizations and a versified excerpt from Heinrich Suso's *Horologium*, or *Wisdom's Watch upon the Hours*. Since it consists of such a hodgepodge of sources and themes and reflects frequently on the writing process, we might say, with James Simpson, that the poem's "single unifying plot is the story of its own composition."[63] However, the poems are bound to one another by more than simply a self-reflexive narrative of composition; in fact, the *Series* becomes a prolonged intergeneric meditation on the various manifestations and problematics of the human gaze and visibility. The poem draws on and contributes to contemporary visionary poetics insofar as it insists that "we inhabit a world in which we are always already beheld."[64]

Admittedly, this sort of theological reading of the *Series* has never quite been in fashion.[65] Yet a reading attentive to the theological underpinnings of Hoccleve's representation of images in the *Series* reveals the poet's sustained interest in both the semantics and the epistemology of visibility. To this end, this section will suggest that Hoccleve's compilation is as self-reflexive about visual production and interpretation as it is about textual production and that this reflection is marked by theological ambivalence about the relationships between images and knowledge, and seeing and understanding. While the *Series* is undeniably concerned with its own textuality, its interest in texts is frequently manifested in its approach to images and vision. Ultimately, it is self-conscious about the way texts mediate vision and visibility.

Like many contemporary contemplative writers, Hoccleve employs discourses of vision to reinterpret his illness as a "visitation" from God. To see God, Hoccleve suggests throughout the *Complaint*, is first to recognize that one is seen by him. For Hoccleve this insight is born of suffering, which, as we will see, functions for the poet as a type of "spectacles." Suffering is evident in the opening lines of the *Series*, but its redemptive and mediatory efficacy emerge more slowly and subtly as Hoccleve reflects on the meaning of his illness throughout the opening sections of the compilation. The *Series* opens with images of autumn and reflections on change: the harvest is over; the green of summer has been replaced by the "broun sesoun" of Michaelmas. And seasonal decay and change, of course, mirror the human life cycle: no one, Hoccleve reflects, can resist the call of death, which is "euery wightes conclusioun" (*Complaint*, 14). The narrator lies in bed melancholic, as he recalls the illness that threatened to overtake both his vision and his will to live:

> I sy wel syn I, with seeknesse last
> Was scourgid cloudy hath been the fauour
> Þat shoon on me ful bright in tymes past.
> The sonne abated and the dirke shour
> Hildid doun right on me and in langour
> Me made swymme so þat my spiryt
> To lyue no lust hadde ne delyte.
>
> (*Complaint*, 22–28)

If the reader did not know better, she might mistake these metaphors so reminiscent of the dark night of the soul or the "mirke cloud" of sin for the words of a contemplative writer. However, as many readers of the poem have observed, the language here is also indebted to traditional Boethian complaint.[66] Yet unlike Boethius, Hoccleve's narrator does not meditate long on the instability of fortune, but rather soon gives name and agency to the divinity that has "scourged" him with illness. His passivity in the divine gaze could not be made more explicit; he complains that "cloudy hath been the fauour / Þat shoon on me" (23–24) and "in langour / Me made swymme" (26–27).[67]

The ambiguity of the opening "I sy wel" also suggests a conflation of physical and figurative vision. The phrase highlights the epistemological import of vision – Hoccleve now understands his experience. But when read in the context of a poem so interested in the limitations of human vision, the phrase also questions the capacity of any human rightly to perceive the state of the world around him. After all, even with the benefit of hindsight, Hoccleve, we soon learn, does not see well at all – either

physically or metaphysically. Here, however, Hoccleve both refers to the fact that he now can understand why "cloudy hath been the fauour" and also reasserts his clarity of physical sight after the mental illness, which, he suggests elsewhere, was as physically debilitating as it was mentally and spiritually draining.

Like this general prologue, the opening lines of the *Complaint* situate Hoccleve's illness within a religious framework. "Almighty God," he writes, "Visiteth folk al day as men may see, / With los of good and bodily seeknesse" (*Complaint*, 36–38). God's visitation is manifested in physical conditions. Hoccleve reads his madness through the lens of the benevolence of God but is frustrated that others who have been "Talkynge this and þat of my seeknesse, / Which cam of Goddes visitacioun" (*Complaint*, 381–82) cannot seem to do the same. His former friends even pretend not to see him when he passes them in the crowd in Westminster Hall and elsewhere in London: "Hire heed they caste awry, / Whanne I hem mette, as they nat me sy" (*Complaint*, 76–77). Hoccleve frames this experience using a biblical precedent:

> As seid is in the psalter mighte I seye:
> They þat me sy fledden away fro me;
> Foryete I was al out of mynde aweye
> As he þat deed was from hertes cheertee.
> To a lost vessel likned mighte I be;
> For many a wight aboute me dwellynge
> Herde I me blame and putte in dispreisynge.
> (*Complaint*, 78–84)

Hoccleve's contextualization of this experience of his friends' "unsighte" through an explicit appeal to biblical narrative both abstracts the alienated poet's experience, identifying him with the psalmist, and gives Hoccleve's complaint about the avoidance of his friends an added element of textual authority. Hoccleve, like the psalmist, is a victim of others' rejection and intentional oversight. Drawing on this biblical language, he provocatively calls himself a "lost vessel," and in so doing emphasizes his self-representation as a material artifact. A central difference, however, between the above loose translation of Psalm 31 and the Psalm itself is the attribution of agency. In the Psalm, God is not the cause of the illness, but is rather the psalmist's refuge in time of social rejection. For Hoccleve, illness is a mark of both God's blessing and his presence.[68] It is a sign of the constitutive gaze of God on the passive human subject. This, of course, is not an uncommon manner of reading illness in Hoccleve's time. The role of "bodelye syeknes" as mystical catalyst is evident in such contemporary

religious writings as those of Julian of Norwich.[69] That Hoccleve insists on linking his illness to a divine "visitation" and his experience with that of the righteous psalmist suggests his desire to be perceived as a voice carrying religious authority.

This "visitation" has marked Hoccleve with visible reminders of his physical and spiritual state. At fifty-three, the poet is beginning to feel the bodily effects of aging and thus acknowledges that he must now learn better ways of managing the increasing darkness that foreshadows his impending death. He represents death as a dark cloud growing ever larger, more threatening, and quickly approaching. "Ripnesse of deeth," Hoccleve muses at one of his more fatalistic moments later in the *Series*, "faste vpon me haastith; / My lymes sumdel now vnweeldy be, / Also my sighte appeirith faste and waastith" (*Dialogue*, 247–49). In Hoccleve's account, there is nothing like Milton's poetic optimism in the face of blindness and death in the revelation that "They also serve who only stand and wait," but only a restlessness and sense of uncertainty about the future.[70] Hoccleve concludes his meditation on bodily decline and imminent death with a sigh of Boethian resignation; the world is full of sorrow and not to be trusted, he admits, for "Thogh a man this day sitte hye on the wheel / Tomorwe he may be tryced from his sete" (*Dialogue*, 264–65).

Moreover, he will later call this visitation a "spectacle / In which þat I beholde may and see, / Bet then I dide, how greet a lorde is he" (*Dialogue*, 96–98).[71] As in his discussion of religious images in the *Remonstrance*, Hoccleve carefully chooses the image of the "spectacle" to suggest the need for visual aid in seeing and understanding God. But this moment also resonates with an earlier moment in the *Regiment* where Hoccleve explains that poverty has helped him *see* God better:

> Now is povert the glas and the mirour
> In which I see my God, my sauveour.
> Or povert cam, wiste I nat what God was,
> But now I knowe and see Him in this glas.
>
> (*RP*, 690–93)

Here, the analogy is that of the (more conventional) mirror. Later in the *Regiment*, the Old Man returns to this image and admits to Hoccleve, "how me blente so prosperitee / That what God was I nothyng undirstood" (*RP*, 1319–20). Where prosperity blinds, poverty serves as "the glas" that enables one to see God more clearly.[72] In other words, poverty is a lens that both reflects and corrects. It enables knowledge of God, knowledge of the self, and knowledge of others.

These three subjects of vision are also central to Hoccleve's use of the metaphor of spectacles. In the *Complaint*, Hoccleve literalizes "the glas and the mirrour" when he confronts his own reflected image in a mirror in his chamber. In this much discussed scene, Hoccleve ultimately concedes that he cannot trust his own vision. After giving an extended description of what "some seiden" of his changed appearance since his madness, he retreats to consider the accusations in solitude:

> Men seide I lookid as a wylde steer
> And so my look aboute I gan to throwe.
> Myn heed to hye anothir seide I beer.
> "Ful bukkissh is his brayn, wel may I trowe."
> (*Complaint*, 120–23)

Although this passage is primarily concerned with the sense of hearing, many of the accusations lodged against Hoccleve emphasize his wandering, unfocused eyes. These visual elements are the key to assessing the nature of Hoccleve's madness. Medical treatises and writings on general health care of the time stressed the close relation of inner and outer, offering advice for ascertaining psychological illness from exterior signs, including the eyes. The physical condition of a person's eyes can suggest, the author of the *Secretum secretorum* claims, the state of his or her soul. Thus, "derke eyen" imply that the person is dangerous or harmful, and this is especially certain, the treatise continues, "yf þei be dry."[73] More relevant to the description of Hoccleve offered in the *Complaint* is the *Secretum secretorum*'s suggestion that "Eyen torned vp-ward sheweth a maner of madnesse."[74] Hoccleve throws his eyes upward and elsewhere adds that his friends said "þat myn yen soghten euery halke" (*Complaint*, 133).[75]

The condition of the wild-eyed poet, however, may also be indebted to his scribal labor. John of Arderne, author of the ophthalmological tract *De cura oculorum*, in recommending a home remedy for "derke sight" (which included the anointing of the eye with concoctions made from rosewater, raw eggs, butter, and urine), claims that it has proven beneficial in maintaining his own eyesight during his long career of studying and writing.[76] Such surgical manuals, home remedies, and advice texts circulated with devotional aids, indicating that the care of the body was closely linked to the care of the soul. For example, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 1468, which dates to the first quarter of the fifteenth century, contains a Middle English translation of *De probatissima arte oculorum* by Benvenutus Grassus, treatises on anatomy, and medical recipes and vocabulary, but also includes part of a *Piers Plowman* A-text.

Likewise, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 685 places Walter Hilton's *Mixed Life*, medicinal recipes, and a Middle English version of the *Secretum secretorum* side by side and ends with a list of sins and bodily senses. These and many other contemporary manuscript collections reveal that, even in the most practical applications of optical theories, body and spirit are understood as dependent on one another.

While this assumed interdependence is evident throughout the *Complaint* and *Dialogue*, it is most striking in Hoccleve's analysis of his friends' comments about his appearance and his own attempts to inter-pret external signs in the subsequent mirror scene. According to these friends, Hoccleve throws his head about like a steer; his eyes seek "euery halke," or remote corner.[77] He, however, is no longer like one of Chaucer's "Yonge clerkes" who "Seken in euery halke and euery herne / Particuler sciences for to lerne."[78] Rather, the "halke" he seeks is a hiding place. Hoccleve's self-representation here strikingly echoes both his character-ization of heretics in the *Remonstrance* as those who, unlike true disciples, flee to "halkes [and] to hernes" (*RO*, 382) and the Old Man's anxiety that Hoccleve's wanderings in the liminal spaces of thought in the opening lines of the *Regiment* indicate an affinity with heretical doctrines.[79] Here as in these earlier poems, both one's desire to hide and one's countenance promise (though perhaps emptily) to betray interior life and beliefs.

Yet as we soon discover, Hoccleve can find nothing abnormal about his exterior countenance. "My spirites laboured bisily," he writes, "To pey-nte contenance, cheere and look / For þat men speke of me so wondryn-gly" (*Complaint*, 148–50). Drawing on the language of visual making, he momentarily portrays himself as a living image to be laboriously crafted from the inside out. In public, he attempts to disguise the physical disfigure-ment he assumes was brought on by the madness. In the privacy of his home in front of his mirror, he attempts to evaluate honestly the implications of the difference between the perception of others and self-assessment:

> And in my chambre at hoom whan þat I was
> Myself allone I in this wyse wroghte:
> I streighte vnto my mirour and my glas
> To looke how þat me of my cheere thoghte,
> If any othir were it than it oghte;
> For fayn wolde I, if it had nat been right,
> Amendid it to my konnynge and might.
>
> (*Complaint*, 155–61)

After what he has overheard in Westminster and the streets of London, he retreats into his chamber to assess if his face looks different "than it

oghte." Here the mirror becomes a technology of reform.[80] First, it provides the medium for the assessment of Hoccleve's countenance, of the image he presents to the world. It gives Hoccleve the opportunity to see himself, or at least his appearance, as others see him. But second, and perhaps more importantly, it throws into relief the nature of the poet-narrator as an image that might be revised, re-formed, or perhaps mediated by explanatory words.

What Hoccleve sees in the mirror, however, does not remove his anxiety about the perception of others.[81] He looks quite normal, he concedes, which raises the question of why others interpret his appearance as that of a mad man:

> Many a saut made I to this mirour
> Thynkynge "If þat I looke in this maneere
> Among folk as I now do, noon errour
> Of suspect look may in my face appeere.
> This contenance I am seur and this cheere
> If I foorth vse is no thynge repreeuable
> To hem þat han conceites resonable."
>
> (*Complaint*, 162–68)

The repetition of the conditional statements prompted by "if" in this section suggests Hoccleve's awareness that he cannot necessarily replicate the image of himself perceived by other "folk." However, after scrutinizing the image in the glass, he is emphatic that there is no "errour" and nothing "suspect" about the image itself.

Such language of suspicion and error again recalls his earlier writing against the Lollards. He is no heretic, he insisted to the Old Man in the *Regiment*, but here as there, he exploits thematic parallels between the poet-scribe and the heretical other in order to highlight the complexities of seeing and interpreting rightly in a culture often driven by a paranoia about rooting out what refuses visibility. As he wrote of Oldcastle:

> Many man outward seemeth wondir good,
> And inward is he wondir fer ther-fro:
> No man be Iuge of þat but he be wood:
> To god longith þat knowleche, & no mo.
>
> (*RO*, 353–56)

While true knowledge and judgment of inward states may lie with God alone, Hoccleve is well aware that human beings also make judgments based on sense perceptions.[82] Yet he suggests that only the mad person confidently asserts his capacity to see through exterior appearances into

interior realities. Hoccleve's gaze into the mirror again suggests the role of reason in proper perception; he implicitly shifts the blame of misperception to those who do *not* "han conceites resonable." Though his own reason is still suspect in the eyes of others, he implies that perhaps rationality is a matter of perspective since uncorrupted sight or reason belongs only to God.

Yet it is not only his own ability to see rightly that occupies the poet. Throughout the *Series* Hoccleve is concerned with the blindness or clouded sight of others. Even as he considers his own faulty vision, he admits that "Men in hire owne cas been blynde alday, / As I haue herd seyn many a day agoon, / And in þat same plyt I stonde may" (*Complaint*, 170–72). In this remarkable admission, Hoccleve concedes that the actual appearance of his countenance does not matter as much as his own perception of it and how it is perceived by those who encounter him. The gaze (whether it is his own or others') begins the process of interpretation even before the act of physical perception. Expectations blind judgment. This proposal of the role of *a priori* assumptions on the part of viewing subjects is reminiscent of William of Ockham's critique of mediating forms.[83] Ockham's denial of mediating species implied that a viewer's ability to *know* (or correctly name) an object is based on an *a priori* knowledge or sensory perception. Thus, for Ockham, there is a dichotomy between sensation and intellectual knowledge, between intuitive cognition and abstractive cognition.[84] In other words, for Ockham, "cognition cannot occur via representation."[85] Seeing does not necessarily lead to knowing. While Hoccleve never explicitly alludes to Ockham, the poet's works often demonstrate the effects of such ocular skepticism.[86] For Hoccleve, this concept is manifested more simply in the developing awareness that any attempt to control his own self-representation ultimately is futile. He will be interpreted according to the *a priori* beliefs of his viewers, despite the image he attempts to project.

Furthermore, Hoccleve must concede that he is as blind as those around him, acknowledging that "in þat same plyt I stonde may." He also will interpret his image according to his own *a priori* assumptions about his sanity. Hoccleve is increasingly aware that he may be incapable of distinguishing his own madness from sanity.[87] Indeed, the poet soon acknowledges that many people "Seemeth ful wys by contenance and cheere" but are really quite foolish, that others "lookith in foltissh maneere / As to the outward doom and iugement / Þat at the preef discreet is and prudent" (*Complaint*, 240, 243–45), and that even though he looks sane, he has never been "wel lettrid, prudent and discreet" (*Complaint*, 251).

Hoccleve reasserts the incongruity between inner and outer, between what is seen and the seer's gaze, again and again throughout the *Complaint*, establishing himself as a seen image and arguing that the act of perception itself is flawed by the corrupt vision of the viewer. The relationship between an image and truth is not a simple one:

> Vpon a look is hard men hem to grownde
> What a man is, therby the soothe is hid;
> Whethir his wittes seeke been or sownde
> By contenance is it nat wist ne kid.
>
> (*Complaint*, 211–14)

If the reader had missed the point in the previous sections, Hoccleve's reiteration of it here clarifies the limits of ocular epistemologies: knowledge of inner "wittes" cannot necessarily be determined by the exterior gaze. However, Hoccleve's fear here and throughout the *Series* is that the human gaze, though erroneous and blind, acts upon the passive image it perceives and in the process of visual interpretation constitutes the public meaning of the "soothe" hidden under the countenance.

Hoccleve, however, remains skeptical about the validity of a self constructed by others. Later in the *Complaint*, when writing of how he imagines himself seen by others, he draws again on the image of a "dirk clowde," but this time connects it more explicitly with poor interior sight:

> In hem putte I no deffaute but oon:
> Þat I was hool they nat ne deeme kowde,
> And day by day they sy me by hem goon
> In hete and cold and neithir stille or lowde
> Kneew they me do suspectly, a dirk clowde
> Hir sighte obscured withynne and withoute,
> And for al þat were ay in swich a doute.
>
> (*Complaint*, 288–94)

Hoccleve claims that even though those who surround him never saw him act suspiciously, they could not judge him to be "hool." Their interior vision, or discernment, was obscured.[88] Like Oldcastle, who looks amiss and whose "sighte is nothyng cleer," his friends' obscured vision leads them astray; they are incapable of judging the truth that Hoccleve proclaims about himself. Stephen Medcalf has argued that Hoccleve here "uses the distinction … between 'withinforth' and 'withoutforth' – not as the Lollard did to contrast inner and outer but to bring them together."[89] It seems to me, however, that Hoccleve emphasizes the continuity of the gaze to stress that obscured sight affects one's ability to draw accurate conclusions but also to consider the relation between sight and knowledge.

Yet the accusation here is also one of blocked vision and is thus similar to those accusations that he brought against Lollards in other parts of his corpus. And even while lodging such an accusation against his friends, he continues to acknowledge his complicity in their blindness.

While complicit, he can perceive something that his friends cannot: that his body is marked by the presence of God. In the final lines of the *Complaint*, Hoccleve returns to the theme of his illness as a divine visitation, concluding:

> For euer sythen set haue I the lesse
> By the peples ymaginacioun,
> Talkynge this and þat of my seeknesse,
> Which cam of Goddes visitacioun
>
> (*Complaint*, 379–82)

Here again, Hoccleve acknowledges the voyeurism of his friends – they see and make snap judgments that they share in gossipy twittering. In articulating a refusal to acquiesce in others' ways of imaging him, Hoccleve aligns himself once again with the contemplative tradition by maintaining that the illness is God's gift. As the remainder of the *Series* will render ever more evident, humans base beliefs on what they see, but their judgments can neither adequately interpret nor constitute the object of their gaze. It is the gaze of God alone that is constitutive. In the end, recovery requires not only awareness that one is seen by God, but also resignation to the reality that humans are always seen and interpreted by others.

With this attitude of resignation and a promise to turn from his sorrowful outlook and mend his ways, Hoccleve concludes the *Complaint* with a formal benediction:

> Laude and honour and thank vnto thee be,
> Lorde God þat salue art to al heuynesse:
> Thank of my welthe and myn aduersitee,
> Thank of myn elde and of my seeknesse;
> And thank be to thyn infynyt goodnesse
> For thy yiftes and benefices alle;
> And vnto thy mercy and grace I calle.
>
> (*Complaint*, 407–13)

Although this benediction has been read as a "pose" of "theological resignation" that is revealed as rhetorically inadequate by the entrance of the social, colloquial dialogue of the next section, it is far from the Boethian resignation of the opening lines of the *Complaint*.[90] In fact, it first reminds

the reader that Hoccleve remains in debt to the constituting divine gaze and second emphasizes the status of the *Complaint* as written text. The resolution Hoccleve seeks in this formalized, theological ending is not a posture of "resignation" but rather a reminder of the mediatory role that texts might play in the regulation of both the human and divine gaze. While calling attention to the *Complaint*'s status as text, it shapes how the reader imagines the persona Hoccleve has crafted. It mediates his authorial image through devotional verse.

The reader's sympathies with the persona Hoccleve has constructed in his *Complaint* are complicated somewhat in the next poem of the compilation, the *Dialogue*, in which Hoccleve gives voice to one of the friends he has accused of "unsighte." The *Dialogue* immediately follows the benediction; as Hoccleve puts down his pen upon the completion of the *Complaint*, he hears a knocking at his door and a loud cry from outside, commanding him:

> "Opne thy dore, Me thynkith ful yore
> Syn I thee sy. What, man, for Goddes ore
> Come out, for this quarter I nat thee sy
> By aght I woot" and out to him cam I.
>
> (*Dialogue*, 4–7)

Hidden within the confines of his chamber, Hoccleve is quickly brought out of his solitude by the cry of a "good freend." Here again we have a gesture toward the problem of "unsighte." Although it is the friend's voice that ultimately draws Hoccleve out of seclusion, his appeal rests upon Hoccleve's hiddenness and absence. Hoccleve, as the reader of the *Complaint* already knows, has not been *seen* for some time. References to Hoccleve's (in)visibility continue as the two men begin to converse. When the friend asks Hoccleve what he was doing, Hoccleve invites him to "come in … and see" (*Dialogue*, 13).[91] When his friend calls him out, Hoccleve reciprocates with a call inward. While his friend desires public visual display, Hoccleve responds by sharing private textual production. However, Hoccleve does not show his friend the *Complaint*; he reads it to him. As scholars have frequently noted, when Hoccleve presents his friend with the *Complaint* he further unsettles any illusion that the *Complaint* we have just read is "direct and impassioned utterance."[92]

By reading the *Complaint*, Hoccleve attempts to teach his friend how to read his image. His poetry is instruction in how to interpret visual experience. But Hoccleve does not find as sympathetic an audience

in his friend as he seems to have expected. After hearing Hoccleve's *Complaint*, the friend urges him not to make it public, fearing that it will only remind others of the loss of wits from which Hoccleve claims to be recovered. As James Simpson suggests, Hoccleve's friend reads the *Complaint* both "diagnostically (looking in it for signs of the narrator's ill health) and ironically (reading the professions of sanity as evidence of continuing mental instability)."[93] Both modes of reading replicate the conundrum Hoccleve most fears in the *Complaint*: that he is not in control of his own image – even when he explains it with words. Others will form an image of him through their own (often predetermined) interpretive lenses. Hoccleve refuses his friend's counsel with a response that sounds thoroughly evangelical; he admits that he is not ashamed of "Goddes strook" because "His chastisynge hurtith no mannes name" (*Dialogue*, 54, 56). He wants others to know: "how our lord Ihesu which is gyde / To al releef and may alle hertes cure, / Releeued hath me synful creature" (*Dialogue*, 61–63). Hoccleve does not only attribute the healing power of Christ to his own situation, but also generalizes it to "alle hertes." In this generalizing move, he treats his recovered body as a visual *exemplum*.

He further emphasizes exemplarity by drawing again on the spectacle metaphor. As I have already briefly noted above, he offers an explanation of his healing in optical terms:

> The benefice of God nat hid be sholde;
> Syn of myn hele he yaf me the triacle
> It to confesse and thanke him am I holde,
> For he in me hath shewid his miracle.
> His visitacioun is a spectacle
> In which þat I beholde may and see
> Bet than I dide how greet a lorde is he.
>
> (*Dialogue*, 92–98)

The visitation, or "spectacle," is now seen as the "yifte" (*Dialogue*, 84) and "benefice" (*Dialogue*, 92) of God. Hoccleve's cured body has become the image of God's visitation: "he *in me* hath shewid his miracle" (emphasis mine). Just as he explains the devotional image as a "spectacle" that "helpith feeble sighte" (*RO*, 417), he sees his own body as an image that enables him to see and reveal God *better*. In *La Male Regle* he treated his body as a negative example, arguing: "It sit nat vnto me, / Þat mirrour am of riot and excesse, / To knowen of a goddess pryuetee."[94] Here, however, his purged body becomes a mirror of God's grace that corrects his spiritual vision. This is, of course, something of a devotional commonplace. Walter

Hilton, for instance, similarly suggests that "thi soule is but a myroure, in the whiche thou schalt seen God goostli."[95] For Hoccleve, physical illness is a spectacle that makes God's attributes clearer, but this visitation also renders Hoccleve's body as a "spectacle" to others that, he insists, "nat hid be sholde."

However, such theological reflection is short-lived. Immediately after articulating the way in which God makes himself present in adversity, Hoccleve launches into an extended diatribe against "coin clippers." While this section puzzled many early readers of Hoccleve's poem, who could find in it little aesthetically pleasing, Paul Strohm has suggested that the introduction of the issue of counterfeiting is entirely consistent with the central themes of the *Series*. Counterfeiters, Strohm argues, are "over-focused and over-reliant on the *appearance* or the surface of matter, in a way that undervalues or deliberately distorts its *substance* or its inner reality."[96] This distinction between outer appearance and inner reality has been central to Hoccleve's complaints of misperception. However, as Strohm shows, the implications of the poet's critique of counterfeiters are much broader than Hoccleve's personal situation. Hoccleve describes counterfeiters here in the same terms as heretics elsewhere in his poetry. He expresses a fear that this "false secte" (*Dialogue*, 191) will multiply if not controlled, infecting the entire land with "this stynkyng errour" (*Dialogue*, 193) so that "trouthe shal adoun be throwe" (*Dialogue*, 195).

The friend, however, ignores this outpouring of anger against coin clippers and rather calmly asks Hoccleve if there is anything else that he intends to write. Hoccleve replies that he has seen a small Latin treatise called "Lerne for to Die" that he wishes to translate: "To clense it sumwhat by translacioun / Of it shal be myn occupacioun" (*Dialogue*, 216–17). At fifty-three, Hoccleve feels that all his bodily and intellectual senses are in decline. Indeed, he complains, "my sighte appeirith faste and waastith" (*Dialogue*, 249). The translation of an *ars moriendi* is an especially appropriate mode of penitence and preparation for death. The act of translation, Hoccleve suggests here, will be for him a spiritual discipline, a form of penitence made after his confession that is intended to "pourge" his body's guilt "as cleene as keuerchiefs dooth sope" (*Dialogue*, 825–26).

But the translation is not only a personal penitential act, it is also social, for with it Hoccleve hopes that "Many anothir wight eek therby shal / His conscience tendreliche grope" (*Dialogue*, 218–19). In expectation of the translation's public influence, he continues:

> Man may in this tretice heere aftirward,
> If þat hym lyke, *reden and beholde*,

> *Considere and see wel* þat it is ful hard
> Delaye acountes til lyf gynne colde.
> (*Dialogue*, 225–28, emphases mine)

Here again Hoccleve conflates seeing and reading, but it is not until his translation of the treatise itself that this connection becomes more than a figure of thought. Hoccleve, having not been seen well but feeling his own vision restored by the visitation of God, is interested in teaching others to see. Learning to see and prepare for one's end, he explains, might be facilitated by reading.

Yet even his close friend (who presumably is listening to this explanation of his recovery and translation plans) still does not see Hoccleve as Hoccleve would like to be seen. Instead, he urges Hoccleve to stop working until "wel stablisshid be thy brayn" (*Dialogue*, 307) and issues the same prescription that Hoccleve issued to Oldcastle: secular reading. In so doing, he implicitly rejects Hoccleve's theological reading of his illness as a visitation from God and replaces it with a secular explanation: "Of studie was engendred thy seeknesse" (*Dialogue*, 379). Hoccleve, however, refuses his friend's advice, calling him "a blynde counseillour" (*Dialogue*, 463). Hoccleve further insists that his madness did not derive from too much study:

> Freend, as to þat, he lyueth nat þat can
> Knowe how it standith with anothir wight
> So wel as himself. Althogh many a man
> Take on him more than lyth in his might
> To knowe þat man is nat ruled right
> Þat so presumeth in his iugement.
> Beforn the doom, good were auisament.
> (*Dialogue*, 477–83)

Though not with explicit reference to vision, Hoccleve insists again in these lines that human perception is limited, and thus it is appropriate that he further promises that he will "nat medle of matires grete" (*Dialogue*, 498). He will write by fits and starts, he explains, closing his book if the work is too difficult or if his "lust dullith and asslakith" (*Dialogue*, 507). His friend, content with this solution, next urges him to consider the subject and recipient of the book, and Hoccleve promises to translate a tale from the *Gesta Romanorum*. "The Tale of Jereslaus' Wife" immediately follows as does Hoccleve's promised translation of the *ars moriendi* and a second tale about women from the *Gesta Romanorum*, translated again at the request of the friend. While all three tales take up the question of the limits and constitution of visibility raised in the opening sections of the

compilation, I will focus the remainder of my discussion on Hoccleve's interrogation of the image in his *ars moriendi*.

In his partial translation of Heinrich Suso's *Horologium*, "How to Learn to Die," Hoccleve turns from the epistemological value of vision to the affective power of the imagination.[97] Yet, following Suso, who famously seeks "to drive out images with images" (to evoke, in other words, the imageless by means of images), Hoccleve calls into question the image and the imagination.[98] At first glance, Hoccleve and Suso may seem strange bedfellows.[99] Hoccleve is, after all, a layperson and a minor bureaucrat, who is frequently characterized as an early proponent of the secular uses of poetry. Suso, on the other hand, is frequently called a "mystic." His writing is ascetic and Christocentric; he seeks to integrate devotional practices with mystical theory.[100] But the two authors similarly explore the relationships between exemplarity and experience and between substance and form. Suso's *Exemplar*, as Jeffrey Hamburger notes, is permeated by an interest in ordering "inner and outer self" and in "the language of exemplification – image and likeness, model and copy."[101] These are, as we have seen, issues that permeate Hoccleve's writing as well. It seems to me that the translation is remarkably appropriate for its context insofar as it addresses and distills many of the issues of vision and images more subtly raised in the *Complaint* and *Dialogue*.[102]

The rationale behind its placement in the compilation, however, is by no means self-evident. Even though Hoccleve promised this translation in the earlier sections of the *Series*, he provides no introduction to it after the preceding poem, "The Tale of Jereslaus' Wife." This narrative disruption has been read, on the one hand, as evidence both of Hoccleve's "fragmented, besieged, yet oddly truncated self" and of Hoccleve's withdrawal "from the attempt to reassume the identity of courtly maker."[103] Burrow, on the other hand, argues that the absence of a transitional prologue once again throws into relief the book's textuality, since in the world of books, "a simple rubric would be enough to link the most diverse items."[104] Yet I would suggest that the two poems are connected by more than a rubric. Although it lacks a narrative transition, the moralization of the preceding tale offers a thematic link between the strikingly different texts: the allegorization hinges on the distinctions between inner and outer, spirit and body, which are so central to the *Series*. Just as the tale's empress finds rest in an abbey:

So torned the soule to holy lyf fro worldy tribulacions wherthurgh all the wittes by whiche the soule vexed was, and troubled been infect with dyuerse seeknesses as ye by the concupiscence of yen, heerynge, by detraccion, and so foorth, wherfore the soule may nat openly be seen of Cryst, hir spowse, til þat all the wittes be confessed openly. (pp. 177–78)[105]

Thus, the allegorization ends with *being seen* by Christ. For the soul to be seen "openly" by Christ the senses must openly be shriven. One might think, however, that the reverse is more traditionally orthodox – that the soul cannot *see Christ* until its blindness is healed through confession. But while emphasizing the need for the cleansing of the flesh through confession, this moralization does not assume that ritual practice will help the soul better see God. Instead, it underscores the poet's interest in how one is seen by others and in what enables and reveals that visibility. What is necessary for this visibility is a confession and cleansing of both inner and outer "wittes." To be seen by Christ, the moralization insists, is not to know him, but to be known by him.

   It is with a rearticulation of this same point that Hoccleve's *ars moriendi* opens. Building on the moralization's insistence on a God that "al seest & woost" and on the conflict between the soul and the flesh, "How to Learn to Die" begins with the following invocation:

> Syn alle men naturelly desyre
> To konne o. eterne sapience,
> O vniuersel Prince, Lord & Syre,
> Auctour of nature in whos excellence
> Been hid alle the tresors of science,
> Makere of al and þat al seest & woost,
> This axe y thee thow lord of mightes moost.
>
> (*LD*, 1–7)[106]

It is natural, Suso had written, for all humans to desire knowledge ("cum omnes homines naturaliter scire desiderant"), but it is God alone who is "Auctour of nature" and "Makere of al." Moreover, in God, seeing and knowing remain unproblematically linked. Implicit here and in the following lines is Suso's reliance on the *Book of Wisdom*, which emphasizes that Wisdom is the "unspotted mirror of God's majesty, and the image of his goodness."[107]

   Although in these opening lines Hoccleve veers little from Suso's original, the inclusion of the treatise provides a theological *raison d'être* for his questions about the limits of sense-based knowledge in the earlier segments of the *Series*. The poet prays that God open to him the treasure of wisdom, give him "a knowlechynge," and explain "Sotil matires right

profownde & greete" (*LD*, 9–13). Wisdom, however, urges him, "sauoure nat so hye" and instead "dreede, herkne" and be taught (*LD*, 15–16). She promises to begin with an affective lesson, teaching him the "dreede of God," which is the beginning of wisdom (*LD*, 20). Thus, even in the invocatory lines, Hoccleve characterizes the narrator as a passive recipient being subtly warned against those very errors of religious curiosity that might lead the amateur theologian into heresy. Indeed, this passage echoes Hoccleve's earlier self-defense in the *Regiment* after the Old Man warns him: "Be waar of thoght, for it is perillous" because "Sum man for lak of occupacioun / Musith ferthere than his wit may strecche" (*RP*, 267, 281–82). Hoccleve there asserts his orthodoxy by maintaining that "noon inclinacioun / Have I to laboure in probacioun / Of His hy knowleche and His mighty werkis, / For swich mateere unto my wit to derk is" (*RP*, 375–78). Wisdom's gentle rebuke and refocusing of the petitioner's desire for theological understanding in "How to Learn to Die" suggests that the lay pursuit of religious knowledge should be teleological, focused on how knowledge of a human's end shapes his or her mode of living. Indeed, the poem concludes with the benediction, "Blessid is þat can see the endynge" (*LD*, 899). Ultimately Wisdom seeks to impart to the disciple a form of moral and affective knowledge based on foresight and hindsight rather than the theological knowledge that he initially requested. He asks her to instruct him in "science," but she insists that it is more essential that he learn "wisdam." And wisdom, she claims, quoting the Book of Proverbs, begins with the "dreede of god" (*LD*, 20).[108]

This sort of vernacular religious instruction was likely deemed both appropriate and important by the ecclesiastical authorities of the period, given the evidence of extant versions of English *artes moriendi* and the apparent popularity of *The Book of the Craft of Dying* in particular.[109] Like many of these texts, Hoccleve's translation generally emphasizes orthodox modes of visual experience. Much like Nicholas Love's *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*, it seeks to instruct by using an image. Moral knowledge, the poem implies, is best gained from visual experience. If Hoccleve sometimes challenges the orthodox equation of seeing with knowing in the early parts of the *Series*, in his translation of "How to Learn to Die" he suggests that sight can facilitate affective devotion and penitence, which in turn might generate knowledge of the self (if not of others). He thus emphasizes the transformative power of the image on its viewer, as he suggested in his apologetic for images in the *Regiment*. Images are useful, he suggested there, not primarily because they teach and focus pious thoughts, but because they "breede" their likeness within

their viewer. As we have noted, in this model, seeing transforms the viewer because it assimilates him or her with the seen object.

While optical models emphasizing visual reciprocity and the subject's assimilation with the object ensured that the visual image maintained a privileged place in the acquisition of moral and spiritual (or affective) knowledge, English religious texts purporting to provide other forms of religious knowledge, such as scriptural exegesis and theological apologetics, were proliferating among the laity by the beginning of the fifteenth century. The more intellectually ambitious of these vernacular texts produced no small amount of anxiety in the ecclesiastical world, which continued to assert that the more abstract or theological forms of thought should be the sole domain of the trained cleric. Images, clerics maintained, still served a unique purpose in the education of the laity, even when those images had to be mediated by the vernacular texts for which the lay audience was clamoring.[110] In his introduction to his *Mirror*, Nicholas Love explains that the book is written in English using visualizable stories of Christ's life for the "symple soule þat kan not þenke bot bodyes or bodily þinges."[111] Similarly, Hoccleve's Wisdom tells the disciple that she will teach using images:

> More to thee profyte shal my lore
> Than chosen gold or the bookes echone
> Of Philosophres and for þat the more
> Feruently sholde it stire thy persone
> Vndir sensible ensaumple thee to one
> To god and thee the bettre for to thewe,
> The misterie of my lore y shal the shewe.
>
> Beholde now the liknesse and figure
> Of a man dyynge and talkyng with thee.
>
> (*LD*, 78–86)

Wisdom claims her teaching is more profitable than philosophical books because it is able to "stire thy persone." She teaches wisdom's mysteries by showing them through "sensible ensaumple." Images, she claims, improve teaching. Her instruction is affective rather than speculative. It is exemplary rather than expository. It is visual rather than textual. In other words, "sensible ensaumple[s]" are like spectacles that improve or correct one's vision and understanding. They are forms that convey and mediate knowledge.

When Hoccleve translates Suso's *Similitudo mortis* as "image," he reinforces the crucial pedagogical and affective role of the visual image in religious instruction. Tellingly, Hoccleve is unique in this translation;

later translators call the apparition *Moriens*.[112] That moral knowledge and transformation are best gained from visual experience with an image that both lives and dies also suggests the temporal nature of visibility. Further, the temporal dimension of the image reinforces Hoccleve's suggestion in the apologetic in the *Regiment* that the image is not static; it has an agency and vivacity of its own.

Yet at the same time, as Hoccleve has suggested throughout his corpus, the image is constructed by its viewer by *a priori* assumptions and interpretation. Presumably drawing on the popular imaging techniques of the period, the disciple manufactures the image prompted by Wisdom's command:

> And in his conceit bysyly soghte he,
> And ther-with-al considere he gan, & see
> In him self put the figure & liknesse
> Of a yong man of excellent fairnesse.
>
> (*LD*, 88–91)

The image constructed in the disciple's mind, many critics have noted, shares striking similarities with the poetic persona set forth in the *Complaint* and *Dialogue*.[113] Like Suso, Hoccleve seems to construct a simulacrum of himself, or at least one that bears significant resemblances to the self he describes in earlier works such as *La Male Regle*, where he described his body as a "mirrour" of "riot and excesse."[114] Here, Hoccleve creates a different sort of mirror. Indeed, he constructs mirrors within mirrors. The poet is mirrored by the disciple and the disciple by the image he calls to mind. In the *Series*, the poet replicates and layers images of himself – as seen by others, as portrayed in his *Complaint*, and finally as made into a visual image.

It is thus appropriate that, like the persona of the *Complaint*, the image first emerges in the disciple's mind crying out a Job-like lamentation for its life and begging for mercy. After hearing "this conplaynte," the disciple speaks harshly to the image, mocking its foolishness and asking why it should be spared from death. The image, understandably, is not comforted by these words and responds:

> Soothly thow art an heuy confortour;
> Thow vndirstandist me nat as the wyse:
> They þat continued han in hir errour,
> Lyuynge in synne vn-to hir dethes hour,
> Worthy be dampned for þat they han wroght;
> And how ny deeth is they ne dreede noght.
>
> Tho men ful blynde been, & bestial.

> Of þat shal folwe aftir this lyf present,
> fforsighte swiche folk han noon at al.
>
> (*LD*, 170–78)

The image explains to the disciple that it does not "bewaille dethes iuge-ment" (*LD*, 179) but rather its own unpreparedness. It, like many people, was blind and lacked "fforsighte" (again, if in different terms, we have an anxiety about "unsighte"). Now, as death inevitably approaches, the image is full of regret. With heavy heart, it proclaims that its "yen been al dymme and dirke also" (*LD*, 228). Again and again, the image laments its blindness and lack of foresight and expresses regret that it had not "seen beforn" the harm "þat now is on me fall" (*LD*, 232–33). Similarly, the dying image proclaims, "Of thaftirclap insighte had no man lasse; / I ouer blynd was" (*LD*, 243–44). It is only as it approaches death that the image begins to open its inner eye and see the implications of its choices. The proliferation of visual metaphors here and throughout reinforces the poet's interest in *how* visual perception (or lack thereof) is related to the acquisition of spiritual knowledge.

The following several hundred lines consist of the image's lament, "O, why ne had y lerned for to die?" (*LD*, 282). The image urges the disciple, "Let me be your ensaumple and your mirour" (*LD*, 295). When the disciple sees the image's torment and regret, he both pities it and asks for advice in order to avoid meeting the same end. The image exhorts the disciple to repent, confess, and make amends for his sins while he still has time. The command is always to see and "reewe." Sight, Hoccleve emphasizes, even textually constructed vision, has a distinctive capacity for fostering pity or affective response. The image also tells the disciple to visualize the judg-ment of God and "beholde often & see" (*LD*, 495) his own soul burning. The poet brings to mind this image within an image. Then, remarkably, the original image places words in the mouth of this second image, hav-ing it cry out to the disciple, "See how y brenne, o, reewe on my langour" (*LD*, 501). This multiplication of images enables affective identification and might be seen as an act of textual mimesis of the assumed multiplication of forms at work in the apprehension of any visible image.

The necessity of learning how to see, or to exercise "fforsighte," is essen-tial to the art of dying and a central concern of "many a man" who lives in blindness:

> Yen they haan and seen nat worth a myte;
> And eres han also and may nat heere;
> They weenen longe for to lyuen heere.
>
> And for they, vndisposid deeth nat dreede,

> fforsighte at al ne haan tho wrecches noon
> Of the harm which ther-of moot folwe neede,
> They deemen stonde as sikir as a stoon.
>
> (*LD*, 523–29)

Those who have not learned how to die are here described in exactly the same terms as the pagan idol that has eyes but cannot see, ears but cannot hear, and is nothing but a piece of wood or a stone. As Hoccleve implied in his characterization of Oldcastle, the human may equally be an image of God or an idol. Unlike the living idol, the human image of God (*imago Dei*) is aware that to see is to acknowledge that one's life is seen by and will be judged by God.

Hoccleve also portrays this judgment in terms of vision. When the image is finally confronted with and exposed by the gaze of God, it exclaims: "O gastful is the iust Iuges lookynge / Vn-to me, now present thurgh fere & dreede, / Which sodeynly shal come him self sheewynge" (*LD*, 687–89). To be seen by God is a "gastful" exposure of the self. Yet at the same time, the privation of the sight of God is the worst of all the torments of hell: "But aboue alle kyndes of tormentis, / Of goddes blissid face the absence / Greeveth most. Þat lack, our moost wofull sentis" (*LD*, 736–38). In the end, it is only the person who has learned how to die who is "disposid the glorie of god to see" (*LD*, 625). The prose lesson appended to the poem similarly suggests that "passynge all the seintes ioies is to beholde the inestimable brightnesse of þat kyng & to be spred with the bemes of his magestee" (p. 214).[115] To open the inner eye to what cannot be seen by postlapsarian corporeal vision is to become aware of personal exposure under the gaze of the just Judge and to understand that the privation of that "blissid" gaze is the worst of all torments.

As the image dies, it narrates the process of its own physical decay. Its face grows pale. Its eyes sink deep into its head. Its hands become stiff, and its breath begins to fail. Its voice is abstracted from its dying body as finally it says:

> No lengere y now see this worldes light;
> Myn yen lost han hir office & might.
>
> But now y see with myn yen mental
> Thestat of al an-othir world than this;
> I am ny goon as faste passe y shal;
> O my lord god a gastful sighte it is!
>
> (*LD*, 664–69)

It is only when the physical body begins to decline that the spiritual eye begins to see clearly. As this "worldes light" wanes, the inner eye opens to

an entirely different world. For Hoccleve, as for many of his contemporaries, "in order for seeing and knowing to coincide, the opaque, unpredictable, fallible conditions of human embodiment must be abstracted, elided, or repressed."[116] Indeed, this is what happens to the image of the young man and also, as the poet explains in the opening sections of the *Series*, is what is happening to him. "Ripnesse of deeth," he told us in the compilation's opening sections, is hastening upon him and his "sighte appeirith faste and waastith" (*Dialogue*, 249). His frequent reference to his need for spectacles attests to Hoccleve's inability to escape his own aging body. However, in the words of the disciple he soon declares, "My myndes yen þat cloos were and shit / I opne" (*LD*, 821–22). The fact that Hoccleve is increasingly aware of the decay of his body, and his sight in particular, is paralleled by an awareness of what can only be understood by the inner eye: that the corporeal world is but a shadow and thus that now he may only see as through a glass darkly.

After the image dies, the disciple, who is deeply troubled by what he has seen, turns to Wisdom and exclaims:

> This sighte of deeth so sore me astoneth,
> Þat wite y can vnnethe in soothfastnesse,
> But am in doute wher the soothe woneth,
> That is to meene if this be in liknesse
> Or in deede swich is my mazidnesse.
>
> (*LD*, 750–54)

As the vision ends, the disciple can no longer distinguish between a "liknesse" and what is "soothe." He asks: does the truth dwell in what we see? Or, in other words, what is the relationship between seeing and knowing? Can one only be left with ocular skepticism, or is there some reality in bodily perception? Where does the truth dwell? In this confusion, I would argue, is found the most concise articulation in the poem of Hoccleve's awareness of the limitations of visual experience.[117] In this momentary difficulty in distinguishing between what is the figment of his imagination and what is "real" in the extramental world, the disciple seems to fall prey to precisely the epistemological confusion and misperception warned about repeatedly in Lollard texts. Whereas he had earlier scoffed at those who suggested that images might be mistaken for their prototypes ("For this knowith wel euery creature / Þat reson hath þat a seint it is noght," *RO*, 415–16), he now experiences the seductive and sometimes misleading power of the image.

Yet Hoccleve's engagement with the ambiguities of visual experience clearly appealed to fifteenth-century audiences. Unlike the *Gesta* tales, this

treatise was excerpted and circulated separately.[118] In fact, as Christina von Nolcken argues, it is "How to Learn to Die" that Hoccleve's contemporaries seem to have read as the centerpiece of the collection. Interestingly, manuscripts often follow the *Series* with John Lydgate's *Danse Macabre* and treat Lydgate's poem as an extension of and conclusion to Hoccleve's compilation.[119] Aside from accentuating the late medieval obsession with death, the coupling of Lydgate's translation of the *Danse* with the *Series* is suggestive of the changing relationship of visual and textual culture and pedagogical practice into the fifteenth century. Lydgate's *Danse Macabre* (which will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter) is fundamentally a visual text, first seen by Lydgate as a fresco on the walls of Holy Innocents churchyard in Paris, then translated into English verse, and in 1430 commissioned by John Carpenter to be painted on the walls of St. Paul's Cathedral in London.[120] This translation from image to text and back to image suggests the fluidity between aesthetic forms in the early fifteenth century, a fluidity highlighted in Hoccleve's interest in the relationships among seeing, knowing, and textual production.

Hoccleve's translation of "How to Learn to Die" provides a partial answer to the problem of social "unsighte" emphasized throughout the *Series*, insofar as it represents a *translatio* from image to text and back to image in which Hoccleve seeks to regulate others' perception of his own image, through both textual containment of that image and multiplication of it. The *Series* suggests that one must be taught to see properly with the corporeal eyes in a postlapsarian world. As the *Dialogue* proposes, to learn the art of dying is to learn how to "reden and beholde, / Considere and see wel" (*Dialogue*, 226–27) so that the reader, like Hoccleve, might ultimately "Lifte vp thyn yen" from the text and:

> looke aboute & see
> Diligently how many folkes blynde
> In hir conceites now a dayes be;
> They close & shitte the yen of hir mynde.
>
> (*LD*, 869–72)

SPECULATIVE POETICS

Hoccleve's corpus thus bears witness to the questions that increasingly surrounded the paired discourses of seeing and knowing in late medieval England. The predominant perspectivist theory of vision in which extramental reality acted upon and transformed a more or less passive viewer

was complicated by the increasing awareness of optical models in which the perceptive agency was located entirely in the viewing subject. This complication of models of visual reciprocity affected more than scientific observations about the workings of physical vision. In Hoccleve's corpus, we see scholastic learning filtering into popular discourses about the relationship between seeing and knowing. Although he articulates traditional, perspectivist models of visionary experience, his writing frequently undercuts these formulations by offering his own deteriorating sight and constantly misperceived body as a site of metaphysical uncertainty. For this reason, his orthodoxy is often called into question.[121] The Old Man in the *Regiment* was unsure of the status of Hoccleve's orthodoxy. Early modern historian John Bale, likewise, thought that Hoccleve was a Lollard.[122] Indeed, as Sarah Tolmie suggests, Hoccleve was fascinated by Lollardy as an "area of metaphysical speculation."[123] Despite his flirtation with vernacular religious discourse and interest in heterodox epistemologies, what emerges throughout Hoccleve's writing in the end is orthodoxy, but not an unexamined and uncontested orthodoxy that merely conforms to the ecclesiastical status quo. Hoccleve's writing is intentionally and consistently speculative when it comes to the epistemological complexities of mediating conflicting theories of vision and the political and theological ideologies that accompany them.

Yet the conflict between competing models of seeing in Hoccleve's corpus also points toward the increasing importance of vernacular texts in explicating and regulating visual experience. While the complex (and frequently shifting) relationships between images and texts throughout the English reformations make any proposition that vernacular texts simply replaced images too facile an argument, Hoccleve's constant use of visual metaphors in poems obsessed with their own textuality suggests that the poet is experimenting with the uses and limits of both forms. Hoccleve inverts the traditional apologetic that images function as books for the unlearned and suggests throughout his corpus that books might both teach readers how to see and remind readers of their blindness, thus moving them to pity and repentance. In a period in which images were increasingly under heterodox scrutiny, Hoccleve uses *reading* to instruct his audience in the art of *seeing*. For just as a "spectacle helpith feeble sighte / Whan a man on the book redith or writ, / And causith him to see bet than he mighte" (*RO*, 417–19), so too Hoccleve suggests a model of "speculative poetics" in which books are treated as textual spectacles, through which images might be better seen and visual experience more effectively mediated.

John Lydgate's refigurations of the image

The substance, the means of art, is an incarnation; not reference, but phenomena.

Denise Levertov[1]

John Lydgate has often been cast as the poster child of fifteenth-century orthodoxy. He represents, in Derek Pearsall's influential words, "the pattern of the new orthodoxy" – an orthodoxy characterized by relentless moralizing and political and ecclesiological kowtowing.[2] Or so the critical story goes. There is, of course, some truth to this account. However, in this chapter I want to suggest that Lydgate's intervention in the image debates is as much (if not more) representative of a new orthopraxis than of a "new orthodoxy." After all, the controversy surrounding religious images is always as much bound up with practice as it is with doctrine, as bound up with how people use images as what they believe about them. Much like Hoccleve, Lydgate is interested in modes of apprehending the material world. But rather than employ vernacular verse to lament the limits of visual certitude, Lydgate crafts poems that instruct the viewer in how to read images. In so doing, he models a literary practice that is reformist and generative, that inscribes the objects and practices of contemporary devotion within an increasingly textual culture.

Lydgate's interest in material culture is well documented, his commitment to exploring the relationship between images and texts less so.[3] However, Lydgate is clearly committed to working in the murky representational borderlands, both by translating material objects into vernacular texts and by theorizing the relative values of the two modes of representation.[4] Images and texts are closely related in Lydgate's writing. He often describes his poetic making using metaphors derived from the crafting of material artifacts; he represents his writing as painting intended to help his readers *see*.[5] But if texts are somewhat like images, the converse is also true. As he explains in a lyric on the pietà, images are visual texts:

> To suche entent was ordeynt purtreture
> And ymages of dyverse resemblaunce,
> That holsom storyes thus shewyd in fygur
> May rest with ws with dewe remembraunce.[6]

For Lydgate, images are first and foremost books, "holsom storyes." This comparison is, of course, a truism of late medieval discussions of image use. Yet Lydgate's assertion of the figural and mnemonic usefulness of "purtreture" sets him apart from many of his contemporaries, who primarily emphasized the affective value of images.

In another lyric, Lydgate urges the "folkys all, whyche haue deuocioun" when viewing visual signs "to haue memory of Crystes passioun, / As doctors remembre in theyr doctryne."[7] This democratic insistence on the capacity of "folkys all" to read complex visual figures with the exegetical skill of "doctors" is surprising given the frequent infantilization of the laity by Lydgate's clerical contemporaries. Nicholas Love most famously promises to "passen ouer" those matters "expownet by holy doctours."[8] For Love, the omission and suppression of such scholarly detail is an act of regulation of lay piety, which, his *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ* suggests, is best kept "bodily," affective, and incarnational.[9] Vernacular devotional works of this period typically are affective and incarnational insofar as they translate Franciscan and Bernardine modes of piety into lay practice and emphasize the role of images and texts in effecting "the stirring of emotion rather than the imparting of knowledge."[10] Lydgate's own writing on religious images has often been read in these terms. Most recently, James Simpson has suggested that Lydgate's religious lyrics might serve as examples of how fifteenth-century religious poetry works "within traditions of the lay-directed, affective image … but also that these very traditions absorb the lives of the learned."[11]

I would like to suggest that Lydgate's insistence on clerical modes of "remembraunce" reveals first his unease with inordinate affect and unmediated visual experience and second his commitment to promoting an altogether different devotional model for the laity – a vernacularization of the hermeneutic practices and literary modes of monastic *lectio* and *memoria*. This clerical approach treats images as prompts for associative memory, as foundations upon which might be layered sets of complex theological figures. Lydgate's translation of these Latinate literary practices to vernacular texts is both conservative and innovative. On the one hand, Lydgate appeals to the authority of a traditional monastic model. On the other, he offers an alternative to the period's dominant "incarnational aesthetic" by translating these traditional, scholarly models

into nontraditional vernacular verse.[12] Thus, this chapter examines how Lydgate's modes of describing Christian images reveal his commitment to producing a clerically regulated, vernacular alternative to popular modes of visual piety founded on affective experience and participatory memory.

In translating Latinate, pre-Bernardine devotional practices and hermeneutics into vernacular poetry, Lydgate both authorizes the vernacular as a mode of theological instruction and reasserts the importance of clerical mediation of lay spirituality. Precisely because he inscribes vernacular religious verse within the figural webs of clerical reading, Lydgate's authorization of vernacular theology is fundamentally different from both heterodox assertions of lay spiritual autonomy and orthodox assumptions that the vernacular is unsuited for more complex or abstract theology.[13] Lydgate's religious poems are almost always more reformist than scholars have hitherto expected them to be. They generate new literary forms from the old and challenge old doctrinal assumptions with engagement with the new.[14] Lydgate treats the sacred images that prompt his poetic reflections on idols and images as textual *loci* where multiple histories, figures, traditions, and sources of authority intersect. Onto affective devotional images he maps alternative modes of remembrance indebted to ecclesiastically mediated history and figural interpretation. In other words, the visual "remembraunce" that Lydgate evokes is more referential than incarnational or phenomenal.[15]

This chapter reconsiders Lydgate's moral and memorial aesthetic and suggests the potential of Lydgate's relatively ignored religious writing to reveal complex negotiations among political ideologies, modes of clerical regulation, and lay devotional practices that both complement and complicate current scholarly paradigms of late medieval vernacular theology and reform. For some time, scholars have neglected Lydgate's massive corpus of religious writing, focusing instead on his politicized narrative histories and his attempts to establish himself as an inheritor of the Chaucerian tradition.[16] But even a cursory examination of Lydgate's religious writing reveals him to be as much "vernacular theologian" as courtly poet laureate, engaging in a number of the most controversial theological topics of his day in a uniquely literary way.[17] In recent years, critics have begun to explore the poetic implications of Lydgate's religious vocation, but many continue to operate on the assumption that the poet's religious writing is little more than an articulation of late medieval official piety or "traditional religion."[18] However, Lydgate is increasingly acknowledged as an important advocate of reform.[19]

This chapter demonstrates that Lydgate's reflections on religious images and their respondents are considered interventions in the contemporary debates about the proper use of religious images. Lydgate does not simply tow the orthodox line; his writing is permeated by a deep ambivalence about visual experience and religious images. I explore this ambivalence in the first section of this chapter, focusing on the ambiguous representation of idolatry in his translation of Guillaume Deguileville's *Le Pèlerinage de la vie humaine*. In this translation, the double-speaking of allegory serves as a linguistic analogue for the semiotic duplicity of images and as a model for interpreting that duplicity. In the second section, I focus on Lydgate's application of figural hermeneutics to his poetic representations of the pietà and *imago pietatis* – two of the most popular devotional images of his time. Just as he layers the narratives of Troy and Thebes with political propaganda to reassert the legitimacy of the Lancastrian regime, Lydgate layers his representation of these images with figural texts to reassert the authority of traditional discourses and ecclesiastical structures. Lydgate thus re-forms the religious lyric, eschewing the dominant ekphrastic and affective model to craft poems marked by their recovery of older devotional forms and practices, their translation of Latinate, or aureate, rhetorical forms into vernacular discourse, and their insistence on referential mediation and moral pedagogy. In the third section, I consider how Lydgate's appropriation of documentary discourses in his "Testament" contributes to his reformation of the image. I argue that he sees vernacular texts as more legible, instructive, and authoritative books for the laity than images can ever be. The chapter concludes with a look ahead to late fifteenth-century readers of Lydgate's religious verse, focusing on the translation of two of Lydgate's lyrics into visual texts painted around the cornice of the lady chapel at Holy Trinity in Long Melford. This translation, I suggest, erases the poems' ambivalence about visual culture and reinscribes them within the affective, incarnational piety of late medieval England. In short, this chapter suggests that it is at the juncture of the visual and the verbal and in the translations between the literary and the material that we might find both literary reformations of the image and fifteenth-century aesthetic theory.

"double entendement" in
the pilgrimage of the life of man

Before we address Lydgate's intervention in English debates about images, we must turn, albeit briefly, to France. Lydgate's trip to France

in 1426 initiated the composition of a series of religious and didactic poems – several of which speak to the poet's interest in material culture. It was in Paris that the poet encountered the newly painted mural of the "Danse Macabre" in the cloister of the Church of the Holy Innocents. Lydgate translated the textual portion of the wall painting into vernacular verse, which was translated, in turn, to England and painted four years later (presumably with images) on a wall at St. Paul's in London.[20] Sometime during 1426, Lydgate also began his translation of Guillaume Deguileville's *Le Pèlerinage de la vie humaine* at the request of the Earl of Salisbury, Thomas Montague.[21] The commissioning of this translation may have served as a testament to Montague's orthodox piety.[22] Montague was, after all, the son of a Lollard knight notorious for his iconoclasm. According to Walsingham, Montague the elder despised images and had removed and destroyed those in his chapel in 1387 (except for that of Saint Katherine, which he permitted to be kept in the kitchen as the servants were very fond of it).[23] It seems safe to say that Montague the younger did not hold his father's views on images.

Although the question of religious images is not central to the allegorical journey of Deguileville's early fourteenth-century *Pèlerinage*, the French Cistercian was clearly concerned about the representation and interpretation of both images and texts.[24] The personification Idolatry makes her first appearance in the poem's second recension in 1355.[25] This addition may be, as Michael Camille has suggested, the effect of a late medieval "image explosion," which many clerics found unnerving and nearly impossible to regulate.[26] If in Deguileville's France, the "image explosion" was primarily a concern of theologians and clerics, in fourteenth-century England, Lollard polemicists forced the debate into the public sphere. Lydgate's amplifications of the *Pèlerinage* (he expands Deguileville's second recension from around 18,000 lines to nearly 25,000) often reflect this escalating public nervousness about the use of images in England. Moreover, Lydgate complicates Deguileville's already ambivalent stance by exploring the duplicity of visual signs, highlighting the similarities between idolater and iconoclast, and adding an extended defense of images by the pilgrim.[27]

From its opening lines, Lydgate's translation dwells on the problem of interpreting semiotic duplicity. In his "translator's prologue" Lydgate explains the governing metaphor of life as a pilgrimage, offers a meditation on double-faced Fortune, and suggests the role of his book in discerning "the verray trouthe." Acquiring knowledge of the "trouthe," he explains, demands earnest diligence and careful reading. Readers must

see through external matter to its spiritual meaning. Lest readers miss this point, Lydgate reiterates this message throughout his prologue, emphasizing that they should not pay attention "To the makyng, but to the sentence" (165). Lydgate thus establishes the terms that will govern much of the subsequent poem, emphasizing the difference between form and meaning, "makyng" and "sentence," and teaching the reader how to understand potentially ambiguous signs. In these opening lines, he also employs a visual language of making and moral edification, explaining, for example, that he translated the poem from the French "that men scholde se, / in ovre tonge" (135–36). This use of "se" is not merely a figure of speech. Only a few lines earlier, he had used a similar formulation to express his hopes that his reader would "as in a merovr, se / holson thynges" (86–87).[28] And indeed, the visual language of allegorical imagery in the following poem is meant to teach readers to see properly. Images and words work together in this didactic task. Reading and seeing are collapsed into one act: to see well is to know how to read an image.[29]

But words and images are not equivalent signs. While Lydgate's use of visual language calls attention to the confluence of seeing and reading in his prologue, in the subsequent poem, the poet reflects on and renders concrete their tangled mutuality. Before the pilgrimage proper begins, Grace Dieu baptizes, confirms, and catechizes the potential pilgrim. One of her last acts is to give him the pilgrim's staff and satchel. In doing so, she offers a striking allegory for interpretation itself. She first commands him: "Lefft vp thyn Eye, be-hold & se" (6241). Yet the pilgrim is still metaphorically blind. He will not be able to perceive the staff and satchel unless he allows Grace Dieu to place his eyes in his ears (6256–58). Susan K. Hagen reads this striking moment as a pedagogical one: to insist that the pilgrim place his eyes in his ears is to teach him the process of visualization and thus of allegorical reading.[30] However, the pilgrim, who is a literalist and materialist, finds this suggestion absurd and "monstrous." When Grace Dieu sees that he is not yet able to understand the metaphor, she elaborates that he must:

> Translate thyn Eyen & thy syht,
> Thyder wher thyn Erys stonde.
> And (as thow shalt wel vnderstonde,)
> Thyn Erys muste haue Eyen clere
> Taparceyve, in thys matere,
> And to conceyven euery thyng.

>   (6298–303)

Here, as we saw with Hoccleve, accurate perception requires a series of translations between the senses. The meaning of material objects can only be properly understood when the pilgrim learns to see as he would interpret words through reading or hearing, and vice versa. But if this scene is a self-referential gesture toward its own allegorical structure, it also emphasizes the danger of relying on sight alone for knowledge. In the following lines Grace Dieu narrates how easily the senses – and especially sight – might be deceived.[31] Hearing is the privileged sense, for it "Kan the telle best the trouthe / In thynges wych that been dotous" (6306–07). In other words, seeing must be tested with hearing (and, I think we can add, reading); visual experience must be mediated by verbal experience. Learning this lesson protects the pilgrim time and again from falling into sin as he encounters, reads, and responds to ambiguous signs over the course of his pilgrimage.

The pilgrim's encounter with Idolatry exemplifies the necessity of verbal mediation and literate interpretation of visual experience. As Camille has suggested, Idolatry differs from other personifications in the *Pilgrimage* in that she does not embody what her name signifies. She is neither identified nor identifiable by her appearance, but rather is known by what she attempts to make the pilgrim do; her characterization is "rooted in a notion of response."[32] The initial description of Idolatry is ambiguous – she appears as an unnamed old woman beating her hands, laughing, and whinnying like a horse. While the homiletic tradition generally allegorized Idolatry as blind, deaf, and dumb (the attributes conventionally ascribed to idols, thus conflating the concept of the idol and the idolater), Deguileville and Lydgate maintain a separation of the two, having Idolatry describe the idol in these terms (20920–21). This separation is, in effect, a rethinking of idolatry. Both the idol and the figure of Idolatry are no longer something entirely other, spectacles marked by distance, but rather are characterized as visual texts demanding reading, interpretation, and response. The problem of response to the image, then, becomes crucial to Lydgate's depiction of the heresy of idolatry and to his own attempts to model a right response through allegorical poetic practice.

As the narrative unfolds, Lydgate implies that the act of seeing is dangerously close to full participation in the act of idolatry. When the pilgrim asks Idolatry why she is laughing, she invites him to come into her house and see for himself. He first notices an image, crowned like a king, placed on a chair, and surrounded by smoke. Next he sees a "vyleyn" kneeling in front of and sacrificing to the image. But the pilgrim is naïve; he only partially recognizes what he is seeing and is unsure how he ought

to respond. As he attempts to make sense of the scene, the whinnying hag urges him to participate:

> "*Behold*," quod she, "and *looke* wel,
> And *se* the maner euerydel
> How I ha Ioye and gret gladnesse
> To *sen* thys cherl, by gret humblesse,
> Toward thys mawmet hym-sylff tavaunce,
> Done worshepe, and obseruaunce;
> And I abyde, for to *se*
> That thow shalt knele vp-on thy kne
> To-fforn hym."
>
> <div align="right">(20861–69, my emphasis)</div>

Idolatry does not directly participate in the act of idolatry; she beholds it and calls others to join her. Idolatry begins with sight. Indeed, terms for seeing are used five times in this short passage. Idolatry asks the pilgrim first to join her in beholding the scene, issuing three commands: "Behold," "looke wel," and "se." As we have already noted, Grace Dieu issues a similar command to the pilgrim to call attention to his spiritual blindness before placing his eyes in his ears. But the command to "Behold" was also very common in medieval complaint poetry and religious verse intended to inspire sympathetic identification with the speaker.[33] Many of Lydgate's own addresses to his readers in his lyrics similarly command "looke on this ffygure" or "beholde and se this glorious fygure."[34] While these are merely rhetorical similarities, they suggest an uneasy relationship between writing about idols and writing about images.

It is for this reason that the pilgrim's response is especially striking: "Lyst for thys thyng I ffyl in blame, / Tel on ffyrst, what ys thy name" (20873–74). Eyes in his ears, the pilgrim finally asks for a verbal explanation of this visual experience. He seems willing to consider joining the churl in worshipping the image but asks for interpretive assistance in discerning whether doing so will fall within the boundaries of appropriate veneration of Christian images. It is easy to understand how the lines between Christian veneration and pagan worship of the image might have become blurred for him. The image of the king on a chair could as easily be the representation of Christ or a saint enthroned as of a secular ruler.[35] Likewise, kneeling "vp-on thy kne" is a position of Christian prayer and veneration before images.[36] And finally, he does not recognize the old hag as a personification of idolatry until she defines herself as such.[37] Thus, this scene provocatively implies that idolatry might look remarkably like contemporary veneration of religious images.

This is why verbal instruction is necessary for visual literacy for Lydgate; even his devout pilgrim needs a little help in identifying the series of images unfolding before him in order to know how to respond. Fortunately for the pilgrim, Idolatry is happy to reveal her name and her defining characteristics to the pilgrim. She is a witch, a daughter of Satan, who desires to "dyfface" (20883) proper honor by leading fools to venerate "stok or ston" (20921). She does so, she further explains, by making Satan dwell in images so that the idol "Yiveth an answere wych ys double / Wych hath (to marren hys entent,) / A maner off double entendement" (20900–02). Idolatry thus creates self-referential sensory objects that are incapable of transcending their own materiality and, when filled with a demonic presence, intentionally obfuscate. Yet "double entendement" is also a central characteristic of the allegorical image. Indeed, both idol and allegorical image signify in complex, duplicitous ways that demand a suitable hermeneutic and a skilled and responsible reader.

As soon as the pilgrim understands that he is observing idol worship, he rushes to the aid of the churl, informs him that he is worshipping an image that "Hath no puissaunce nor power" (20956), and encourages him to repent of the sin of idolatry. Angered by the criticism of his image, the churl asks the pilgrim how he dares to reprove him for veneration of it:

> Syth pylgrymes, in ther passages
> Honowre and worshepe, euerychon
> Ymages off tymber and off ston;
> And crystene peple, ful nyh alle,
> On ther knes to-forn hem falle
>
> (20966–70)

The churl is able to articulate the ambiguity between veneration of a true and a false image that had temporarily paralyzed the pilgrim earlier when Idolatry had asked him to participate in the adoration of the image. Thus, Lydgate again suggests that Christian image veneration and idol worship often look exactly the same.[38] In other words, when we only see with our eyes, there is little difference between honoring an image and honoring an idol.

However, the pilgrim now has an interpretive framework for understanding and responding to such critiques and offers a response to the churl that, on the surface, sounds like little more than a rote repetition of the ecclesiastical defense of images. In Deguileville's version, the pilgrim concisely rebuts the churl simply by noting that, for Christians, images are books for the unlearned. Lydgate's version expands this rebuttal to

over seventy lines, drawing on the standard threefold apologetic (images inspire, remind, and teach), which had become a commonplace in vernacular defenses of images. Lydgate alludes to this conventional defense but predominately focuses his pilgrim's rebuttal on the instructional value of images. Conspicuously absent in Lydgate's apologetic is the affective use of religious images. This is especially striking since the affective importance of images came to the fore in the later Middle Ages, and images came to be understood not as merely equal to but as more useful than written books because of their ability to prompt devotional feelings. Contemporary spiritual writings bear witness to this increased focus on the affective use of images. Margery Kempe is famous for her intensely emotional responses to images of the infant Christ and the Virgin Mary. The dramatic tableaux of the Corpus Christi drama were often designed to mimic popular visual art and, like other contemporary religious literary and artistic forms, were meant to lead their spectators into a "deeply felt response."[39] And, as we have seen, even John Wyclif valued images for their ability to stir feelings of devotion (though he believed that the image itself should be forgotten as quickly as possible to avoid the temptation of idolatry).[40] Given this cultural context, it is telling that Lydgate omits the apologetic for images based on their affective power at this crucial moment.

Instead of emphasizing their affective power, he highlights their didactic and referential qualities. The pilgrim first offers a figural argument in defense of Christian veneration of images, claiming that it is not the artifact that is worshipped but what it represents:

> ffor, sothly, we nothyng laboure
> The ymages to honoure,
> Stook nor ston, not that men peyntes;
> But we honoure the holy seyntes
> Off whom they beryn the lyknesse
> In our mynde, to enpresse,
> By clere demonstraciouns,
> Ther martyrdam, ther passiouns

(20977–84)

Drawing on the language of medieval semiotics, he adds (echoing Hoccleve) that images are "spectacles" and "merours" that make present to the worshipper's mind what cannot be known without such mediation. The Christian is able to discern their "trewe menyng and ther entente" (20988) because he or she has been trained to read images as useful signs. Understanding the relation between the image and what it signifies is essential for both the efficacy and orthodoxy of the veneration.[41] The

pilgrim claims that Christians are able to differentiate between signi-
fier and signified although both Lollard and orthodox writers warned of
possible semiotic confusion around images.[42] The emphasis on the clar-
ity of images continues in the next stage of the pilgrim's defense, where
Lydgate again stresses the referential role of images, having the pilgrim
argue that it is not the saints that are venerated, but rather their exem-
plary lives: "Ymages presente to Our mynde, / And to vs, clerly expresse,
/ Off her lyvyng the holynesse" (21002–04). Thus, sensible artifacts aid
memory. They help the viewer recall and imitate the stories of the holy
lives of the saints. The images make the saints "presente to Our mynde"
in a way that momentarily collapses temporal boundaries between the
past and the present. Finally, the pilgrim reminds the churl that images
are to be used as books for the unlearned, intended to educate rather than
to answer prayers or perform miracles. But even this distinction has its
difficulties since the unlearned need to be taught how to read images – a
point emphasized in *Dives and Pauper* when Dives requests that Pauper
teach him "a lytyl betere to knowe þis tokene and to redyn þis book."[43]
Yet the importance of additional instruction in visual literacy seems lost
on Lydgate's pilgrim, who repeatedly stresses the simple clarity of images
(21011–15) despite his own initial hesitance in reading the ambiguous
enthroned image only lines earlier.

Unlike the pilgrim, Lydgate implicitly acknowledges that viewers need
verbal guidance to interpret images properly. To this end, his poetic cor-
pus includes a number of didactic lyrics intended to teach the laity to
read visual and material signs.[44] Intended, we might say, to help others
put their eyes in their ears. For example, Lydgate's insistence that images
function as material signs and memorials is evident in his didactic poem,
"On Kissing at Verbum Caro Factum Est," where he is clearly concerned
with lay instruction in the proper use of material objects.[45] He appeals to
lay worshippers who prostrate themselves in churches and kiss "stoone
or tre, / Erthe or yron, haue in remembraunce / What they do meane,
take the moralyte."[46] The remainder of the poem is a figural explanation
of the material artifacts mentioned in these opening lines. Earth signifies
Christ's humanity, the stone is a reminder of his sepulcher, and the iron
is a symbol of both the spear that pierced his side and the nails in his
hands (5–8). The final three stanzas of the poem offer a meditation on the
wood of the cross that quickly moves from the purely physical to a com-
plex spiritual reflection, as if Lydgate were teaching his readers the sort of
referential process that material objects should prompt. He writes in the
second stanza:

Thynke on the crosse, made of four dyuerse trees.
As Clerkes seyn, of Cedyr and Cypresse,
To hygh estates and folkes of lowe degrees
Cryst brought in pease, the Olyfe bereth wytnesse;
The Cedre aloft, contemplatyf swetnesse,
Graue all these sygnes depe in thy memory.

(9–14)

With a turn from the physical objects that the lay worshippers encounter to the words that "Clerkes seyn," Lydgate demonstrates the mental transition that must be made from the physical to the spiritual and from the image to the word. Since the mind is able to remember images that the body cannot see (such as the four kinds of wood in the cross), Lydgate is able to request that his readers, "These .iiij. fygures combynyd in-to oon, / Put in thy mynde for a memoryall" (17–18).[47] The pilgrim's attempt to apply this logic of signs and memorials in *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*, however, does not impress the churl. Likewise, his attempt to differentiate Christian images from less efficacious pagan images ultimately prompts violence – the section concludes with the churl's threats to behead the pilgrim if he continues to refuse to worship the image.[48] In both contexts, the threat of beheading links for a moment the violence of the idolater with the violence of the iconoclast. It is only the middle ground of appropriate veneration of images that survives Lydgate's critique not implicated by such destruction.

The lesson to be learned from this allegorical interchange is clear: there is a fine line between proper and improper use of images, and those who abuse them are both foolish and socially dangerous. For Lydgate, images are best used as memorial signs, as visual texts that instruct by reminding. Moreover, Lydgate understands his own textual practice as intrinsically connected to images, which become places of tension in his work that he attempts to mediate and perhaps even resolve through poetic amplification and figural exegesis. When writing on the devotional images used by his own society, Lydgate, as I will show, attempts to pre-empt their abuse by situating them in complex historical and figural frameworks, by helping his readers, in other words, put their eyes in their ears. As his *Pilgrimage* suggests, Lydgate's writing on images is ambivalent. His apologetics in English verse are for lay instruction but they neither simplify the issues nor merely rehearse the standard threefold explication. Rather they draw on homiletic and exegetical frameworks to rethink the concept and use of "image" and ultimately perform a series of translations: from image to text, from memory to history, from suffering to victory, and from affect to intellect.

"WITH DEWE REMEMBRAUNCE": MEMORY, AFFECT,
AND LYDGATE'S PIETÀ

Both Lydgate's ambivalence and his mode of regulatory and homiletic amplification are evident in his lyric "On the Image of Pity," a poetic rendering of the extremely popular image of the pietà.[49] The image of the lifeless Christ stretched across his mother's lap was a relatively new devotional object, with the earliest versions appearing in Germany in the early fourteenth century.[50] Apparently intended as Nativity scenes, these early images represent a young, smiling mother with a child-size Christ in her arms. Within a century, however, Mary's gladness had given way to mourning. The representation of her sorrow had become one of the most widespread and popular visual images in England.[51] The popularity of the image needs little explanation; it was an especially suitable object of devotion in an age of increasing Marian piety, emphasis on the Passion and humanity of Christ, and affective meditation. As Richard Marks suggests, "Our Lady of Pity was a subject whose primary appeal lay in emotional responses evoked by sight. The capacity of this particular image to embody a subtle range of meanings could be conveyed with greater effect visually than by means of the written word."[52]

The affective potential of the image was easily exploited in both its visual and literary expressions. Makers of the image emphasized the emotional qualities of the scene by adding pathetic details: in some versions of the image, the Virgin's tearful gaze is fixed on her son; in others she looks sorrowfully outward, as if beseeching the viewer to participate in her agony and feel her pity.[53] The image's affective power, however, was also rooted in its relative freedom from the confining particularity of the historical narrative of the Passion.[54] Its lack of narrative context made the image generalizable. The visual image was doggedly multitemporal and incarnational, skirting historical context and complex typological reference in order to resituate the figures of the Passion within the viewer's memory as experientially present.[55]

Contemporary literary depictions of the pietà, like their visual analogues, sought to make the image experientially present to the reader.[56] Poets often abstracted the image and embellished it with affective details (such as cries of lament) to heighten the emotional effect.[57] For example, the lyric "Who can not wepe, come lerne of me," describes the author's intensely personal encounter with the weeping Virgin who calls out to the reader: "who can not wepe, come lerne of me."[58] Indeed, pity is the lesson of the image if there is one. Margery Kempe's tearful encounter with "owr Lady clepyd a pyte" in a church suggests that she has learned this

lesson well.[59] When a priest requests that she hush, saying that Christ died long ago, she replies that Christ's death is as fresh to her as if it had just happened. For Margery, then, the image facilitates a collapsing of temporal boundaries; it makes the past present to her.[60] Although Lydgate certainly would have been familiar with the way of seeing articulated by Margery and the weeping Virgin, its affective intent and more importantly its insistence on the necessity of collapsing temporal boundaries are conspicuously absent in his poetic depiction of the pietà.[61]

Lydgate's poem "On the Image of Pity" begins with a gesture toward the desired affective response, making an appeal to the reader's gaze and emotions. Yet by its final stanza the poem has become a theological argument about the validity and right use of images that emphasizes their importance as mnemonic devices. What Lydgate means by "remembrance" in this verse apologetic is quite different from Margery's understanding. Whereas Margery's memory is participatory and suggests a suspended, atemporal moment, for Lydgate remembrance implies the recollection of a multilayered but distant history that may (but does not necessarily) enable contextualization of the present.[62] Lydgate's poem begins in the present, condemning the reader's hard-heartedness and directing his gaze to the "peyne" inflicted on the Virgin because of his "offence":

> O wretched synner! what so ever thow be,
> With hert endurat hardar than þe stone,
> Turne hidder in hast, knelle doun, behold and se
> The moder of Cryst, whose hert was woo begon
> To se her childe, whiche synne dide nevar non,
> For thyn offence thus wounded & arayd;
> Rewe on that peyne, remembringe here vpon,
> Pray to that quene, that moder is, and mayd.
>
> (1–8)

The poem commands the reader, represented as a hard-hearted, "wretched synner," to turn and "behold and se" the image, thus mirroring the woeful gaze of the mother who beholds her son. Yet unlike other contemporary lyrics on the pietà, the reader here is not called to identify with or suffer alongside Mary but rather to see Christ and the Virgin's agony as a direct result of "thyn offence." Mary suffers because of the reader's sin. For Lydgate, then, the image becomes a memorial and penitential device, intended to prompt guilt that will lead to repentance.

While guilt might be an affective response to the image, it is not the primary one suggested by the visual image itself. Indeed the affective appeal of the poem's opening lines is more suggestive of pre-Bernardine

forms of Marian devotion than late medieval affective piety. As Rachel
Fulton suggests, "early prayers to Mary focus more or less exclusively on
the sufferings of the sinner – wretched and miserable and in desperate
straits, his or her only hope the intervention of Mary or the mercy of her
Son."[63] In the opening lines, Lydgate depicts Mary as a celestial queen
rather than the weeping woman of many contemporary representations.
Likewise, Lydgate's Mary is an exalted intercessor and mediator; she is not
a figure with whom one would want to identify too intimately. Lydgate's
appeal to "Rewe on that peyne, remembringe here vpon" reminds the
reader of the necessity of clerical and historical mediation. He does so by
inscribing both the initial, affective image and the guilt it prompts in a
versified discussion of forms of ecclesiastical authority and figural history.
Intercession and clerical mediation are needed for the resolution of this
guilt, Lydgate suggests, and Mary, rather than functioning as a model of
sorrow, serves as the paradigmatic intercessor.

The second stanza moves away from the suggestively affective gestures
toward Mary's maternal sorrow of the opening lines and turns to theo-
logical reflection on the Fall of humanity as the requisite pre history for
the glorification of Mary. In so doing, Lydgate makes a figural leap to the
Garden of Eden, noting the *felix culpa* that led to the Fall of Adam but
also enabled the Virgin to assume her role as intercessor:

> With this conceyt, þat yf syne had not bene,
> Causynge our fadar Adam his grevous fall,
> Of heven had she not be crounyd quene,
> Ne ther ataynyd astate emperiall.
>
>   (9–12)

Although the first stanza is a direct appeal for the reader to "behold and
se" a pietà and "Rewe on that peyne," by the second stanza Lydgate has
begun to specify how the reader should go about "remembringe here
vpon" – namely by adding layers of scriptural typology and contempor-
ary Marian piety to supply this ahistorical image with a past and a future.
Thus, he suspends the figure of Mary between iconographic and textual
worlds, using the initial image of the pietà as a foundation for monastic
lectio, which, in Jean Leclercq's formulation, is a mode of "reminiscence
whereby the verbal echoes so excite the memory that a mere allusion will
spontaneously evoke whole quotations and, in turn, a scriptural phrase
will suggest quite naturally allusions elsewhere in the sacred books."[64]
Here, Lydgate's poetic process mimics the referential layering and gather-
ing of *lectio*: his introductory allusion to the pietà and human sin suggests

a figural link to the Fall. The Fall necessitated the Incarnation, which, in turn, enabled the exaltation of Mary as queen and intercessor.[65]

The Virgin represented in the lyric's second stanza is an entirely different figure from "The moder of Cryst, whose hert was woo begon" with whom Lydgate began. While the pietà is meant to direct its viewer's attention to the compassion of Mary, Lydgate's representation of Mary as a queen who has "ataynyd astate emperiall" emphasizes religious power and authority rather than sorrow.[66] She is no longer earthly and human, but rather is now in heaven and thus is distant and impassive. Yet because she has been transformed from earthly mother to celestial queen, she is a powerful intercessor for penitent humans. To this effect, Lydgate instructs his reader:

> Besechyng her þat this memoriall
> Of very pitie wold meve hir for thy grace
> To pray þat lord, which may pardon all,
> To here her bone.
>
> (13–16)

Lydgate returns to the theme of "pitie" here, but in an entirely different context. Instead of identifying with the pity of the weeping Virgin, the penitent reader uses this "memoriall / Of very pitie" to move the queen to intercede on his or her behalf. Here, sympathetic identification with Christ is the provenance of Mary rather than the reader. Further, the goal of "pitie" is not identification with the suffering mother of Christ, but rather pardon by "þat lord." To leave Christ nameless at this point is to reject again the affective intimacy inherent in the image of the pietà and choose instead a much older devotional model. Mary's intercessory power was emphasized in Offices of the Virgin in the Benedictine Reform of the latter half of the tenth century; yet as we have already noted, it was not the predominant depiction of the Virgin in Lydgate's fifteenth century.[67] In this earlier model, Mary's role as intercessor parallels the mediatory role of *ecclesia*.[68] While Lydgate does not explicitly draw this association, the figural echoing of the mother of Christ and the mother church as mediators and intercessors returns the poet to the necessity of ecclesiological mediation in his time.

Although Lydgate's corpus reflects his special devotion to Mary, here he implies that it is not sufficient for the laity to seek intercession and pardon in her. Perhaps responding to the Lollard critique of the clerical role in confession and absolution, the poet next insists that assurance of heavenly pardon remains under the jurisdiction of earthly ecclesiastical authority.[69] To emphasize this point, after instructing the reader to remember the Fall

of humanity and the glorification of Mary and then to pray for interces-
sion, Lydgate next tells the reader "with hasty pace":

> Rene to a prest whill this is in thi mynd,
> Knelynge down lowly withe hert contryt,
> Tell out bothe croppe & rote, leve nought behynd –
> Thy synnes all, be they gret or lyte,
> Wher they were blake, then shall they wexe whyt.
>
> (17–21)

Though the Virgin has the authority to intercede, the penitent must fol-
low the proper ecclesiastical procedures to ensure pardon by confessing to
a priest "whill this is in thi mynd." The "this" here is neither the "image of
pity" nor a feeling of compassion. Rather, it is the series of figurally linked
textual images we have just seen unfold. It seems appropriate, then, that
the stanza concludes with a set of didactic instructions such as those that
a confessor might give to the recently confessed penitent: "Continew in
clennys, & then thow schalt be quyte, / And saffe fro feendes all that are
in helle" (23–24).

We might expect Lydgate to end his poem here. He has led the reader
from a simply affective visual experience to participation in the ecclesias-
tically regulated act of confession. Yet he continues with two stanzas of
commentary on his own "reading" of the image. He instructs the reader:

> Enprynt thes wordes myndly thy hert within,
> Thynk how thow sest Cryst bledyng on þe tre,
> And yf thow steryd or temptyd be to syne
> It shall sone sese and pase a-way from the.
> Remembre all so this dolorus pytie,
> How þat this blyssid ladye thus doth enbrace
> Her dere son ded, lygyng vpen her kne,
> And, payne of deth, thow shalt not fayll of grace.
>
> (25–32)

Lydgate returns to the image of the pietà that initiated the subsequent
figural threads we have traced and offers the first description of the visual
image itself. But here again the description is entirely lacking in pathetic
detail. There is neither weeping nor wailing in Lydgate's account, despite
its description as "dolorus." The Virgin is as impassive at the death of
her son as she will be after her Assumption and glorification. Lydgate's
descriptive austerity re-emphasizes that his charge to "Remembre … this
dolorus pytie" is not a call to affective identification but rather a visual
prompt for figural and textual remembrance.

This point is suggested by the opening lines of the stanza, in which Lydgate instructs the reader: "Enprynt thes wordes." Although he often associates the act of writing or printing with remembering, it is noteworthy that here Lydgate asks the reader to imprint *words*, not the visual image. Similarly, Lydgate's four-line apologetic for images at the conclusion of the poem blurs the distinctions between visual and textual remembrance and betrays his thinking about the proper use and limitations of images:

> To suche entent was ordeynt purtreture
> And ymages of dyverse resemblaunce,
> That holsom storyes thus shewyd in fygur
> May rest with ws with dewe remembraunce.
>
> (37–40)

As I have already noted, Lydgate's point in its simplest form is that the purpose of pictures is to remind. However, understanding the more subtle nuances of this short apologetic hinges, in part, on how the reader interprets the crucial, but slippery, word "fygur." A figure might be a person, a material image or representation (such as a pietà), a written character (such as word, letter, or even poem), or a sign or symbol.[70] Lydgate could simply be reciting the orthodox argument that pictures teach through telling stories. Alternatively, he could be punning on the word "fygur" to indicate the "holsom storye" he has just unveiled in verse that develops, as we have seen, by means of a series of figural associations.[71] Further, to say that "purtreture" was established merely for "remembraunce" is only a partial representation of the standard defense of images.[72] As in his translation of *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*, the affective use of images is absent.

This absence, I would suggest, is especially conspicuous in this poem given the usual affective import of the pietà. Christine Cornell argues that the poem "depends upon a distinct division of labour. The picture stirs our emotions, and the poem instructs us in the use of these emotions."[73] While this is the case with similar complaints, it is my claim that Lydgate's poem not only regulates the emotion stirred by the image by inscribing it within texts, figures, and institutions but also rejects unmediated experience prompted by such emotion. Unlike other contemporary lyrics on the pietà in late medieval England that seek to complement and give a voice to the image of the suffering Virgin in order to prompt affective devotion, Lydgate subordinates the image to his text by circumscribing the image within the realm of textuality. He does this in two ways: first, he minimizes its affective power by substituting figural exegesis for pathetic description; second, he undermines

the image's ability to collapse temporal boundaries by situating it as only one of a series of figural images and emphasizing the textuality of "remembraunce." The image is rendered unnecessary by these poetic and theological manipulations since the text no longer requires the image to achieve its theological and didactic goals. As the poem's final lines suggest, the image is useful for prompting remembrance, but the complex workings of remembrance are only found in the "holsom storyes … shewyd in fygur" when they are theologically appropriated and read as texts.

<div align="center">

"LOOKE ON THIS FFYGURE": TYPOLOGICAL DISTANCE
AND LYDGATE'S *IMAGO PIETATIS*

</div>

Such theological appropriation is also evident in Lydgate's lyric "The Dolerous Pyte of Crystes Passioun," a poetic treatment of another image, the *imago pietatis* or the "Man of Sorrows."[74] The *imago pietatis* was even more popular than the pietà in late medieval England (perhaps, as Émile Mâle suggests, because great indulgences were attached to it) and was an object of both private and public devotion, appearing in books of hours, on wall paintings and stained-glass windows, and on tombstones.[75] It was, as Gertrud Schiller adds, "the most precise visual expression of the piety of the Late Middle Ages."[76] Like the pietà, the *imago pietatis* is extra-biblical, multitemporal, and designed to prompt sympathetic identification.[77] In the image, Christ still seems to be suffering although he is clearly dead; he is standing upright, but his head droops and his arms are crossed, displaying the gaping wounds on his hands and in his side.[78] By the beginning of the fifteenth century the *imago pietatis* was linked with the mass of Saint Gregory, began to be widely disseminated throughout Europe, and was frequently used to sell indulgences.[79]

Like the Eucharist, when viewed with proper devotion the *imago pietatis* was thought to make Christ experientially present to the viewer. Its close association with the Eucharistic piety of the mass of Saint Gregory also suggests the role the image played in clerical regulation of lay religious experience.[80] Christ's wounded body was endlessly reproduced both on the altar under ecclesiastical control and through the proliferation of images and vernacular devotional texts. These images and texts capitalized on the period's obsession with Christ's humanity and each Christian's ability to experience Christ physically in the Eucharistic bread, an experience, however, always already mediated by the priest. The *imago pietatis*, in this vein, fostered sympathetic identification with the suffering man.[81]

In addition to its emphasis on the humanity of Christ, like the pietà, the emotional efficacy of the image was also related to its detachment from spatial and temporal contexts. The image is isolated from the historical Passion narrative. It contains no reference to historical time and advances no doctrine.[82] Contemporary religious lyrics accentuate this atemporality and the suffering of the wounded body through several distinctive characteristics: they focus on the wounds and suffering of Christ; they are addressed to the individual reader; and they emphasize Christ's own emotion, suggesting most specifically that love is his motivation for enduring the Passion. In such lyrics, the wounded Christ often addresses the reader personally, as in the following excerpt from a lyric found in British Library, MS Harley 2339:

> Wiþ a spere scharp, þat was ful grill,
> Myn herte was persid – it was my wil –
> For loue of man þat was ful dere;
> Enuyous man, of loue þou lere.[83]

Similarly, the Christ of the popular fifteenth-century lyric "Wofully araide" describes how he wears a crown of sharp thorns and bleeds to death "for þi love" and asks "What might I suffer more / Þen I have suffered, man, for þe?"[84]

Lydgate, however, wants little to do with either the suffering or the love-longing Christ central to many lyrics on the *imago pietatis*.[85] For Lydgate, the meditation on Christ's crucified body enabled by the image is an opportunity to pray for salvation from the suffering of hell.[86] To this end, Lydgate represents Christ not as a static artifact designed to arouse love and pity but rather as a complex poetic web of figurally linked visual and textual images slowly revealed by a dynamic layering of sources and designed to rewrite the simplicity and atemporality of the initial "dolerous pyte." This translation from the initial affective image to the complex text representing a multifaceted image of Christ is effected, as in "On the Image of Pity," by Lydgate's insistence on the gathering and layering of typological images and orthodox religious practices.

Like "On the Image of Pity," "The Dolerous Pyte" begins with a reference to the material image that prompts the verse meditation:

> Erly on morwe, and toward nyght also,
> First and last, looke on this ffygure;
> Was ever wight suffred so gret woo
> For manhis sake suych passioun did endure?
> My bloody woundis, set here in picture,

> Hath hem in mynde, knelyng on your kne,
> A goostly meruur to euery Cryature,
> Callid of my passioun the dolerous pyte.
>
> <div align="right">(1–8)</div>

The above lines seem, in many ways, to encourage an affective response to the image. However, they also foreshadow a redirection of that emotion into a typologically complex meditation on how such a "ffygure" should be read. The image becomes a text to be interpreted, using all of the available exegetical tools.

The ambiguity of the initial term "ffygure" is again thrown into relief by Lydgate's deployment of the visual figure to prompt a series of figural interpretations of the Passion. The *imago pietatis* itself is certainly a figure, when we read the term to mean a material representation or a likeness as in a statue or painting. But as we have noted, the term can also apply to texts, words, and allegorical modes of reading.[87] Thus, from the opening lines of the poem, the reader is forced into the ambiguous borderland between image and text. The ambiguity continues throughout the first two stanzas as Christ describes his bloody wounds as "set here in picture." But the term "picture" is also somewhat ambiguous as it is also used frequently in exegetic and homiletic writing for rhetorical description.[88] The second stanza employs additional polysemous terms, as easily applicable to words as to images, urging the reader: "Set this lyknesse in your remembraunce, / Enprenteth it in your Inward sight" (9–10).

However, "this lyknesse" or "ffygure" implied as the object of the reader's gaze is soon traded for a decisively nonvisual figure as Lydgate adds to the *imago pietatis* an image of Christ as warrior and champion who promises to defend the reader "Ageyn the fend, þe flessh, þe world" (14). This is not the Christ of the *imago pietatis*; it is the Christ of the early Middle Ages, who, as Rachel Fulton suggests, was "far more comfortable on the battlefield than in the heart, a war-leader rather than a lover, an all-powerful warrior and king of heaven rather than a pitiable victim of human sin, his Cross not so much an instrument of torture as a weapon of victory."[89] This *imago pietatis* commands its viewer:

> Make me your pavis, passith not your boundis,
> Ageyn al worldy Trybulacioun,
> In ech temptacioun, thynk on my blody woundis,
> Your cheeff saffcondyt, and best proteccyoun,
> Your coote armure, brest plate & habirioun,
> Yow to dyffende in al adversyte,

And I schal be your Trusty champioun
Whan ye beholde this dolerous pite.

                                                                    (17–24)

This representation of Christ has puzzled readers of this poem. Woolf and Schirmer, in particular, see Lydgate's introduction of the Christ-knight image here as creating an infelicitous juxtaposition with the *imago pietatis*.[90] While the representation of "Christ as champion" emerges as a central, nonvisual image by the conclusion of the poem, I find it likely that in the second and third stanzas Lydgate is envisioning a different, though closely related, visual image that clarifies the figural relationship between the *imago pietatis* and the warrior Christ: the wound-marked shield.[91]

   In the second stanza, Lydgate's Christ speaks of his "hertys wounde, percyd with a launce … Yow to dyffende in your treble ffyght" (11–13). The third stanza opens with Christ asking the reader to "Make me your pavis" against worldly tribulations and calling himself "Your … best proteccyoun, / Your coote armure, brest plate & habirioun" and your "Trusty champioun." This association of Christ with a shield suggests Lydgate's awareness of the popular fifteenth-century image of the shield in which Christ's wounds appear as the crest.[92] The frequent visual association of the five wounds in paintings of the *imago pietatis* with the image of the wounded shield or "pavis" provides for Lydgate the means for a rhetorically subtle transition to the image of Christ as conqueror. The third stanza of the poem begins with the shield image and expands into the image of the entire warrior by layering on the image of the "pavis" the other knightly accoutrements: the "coote armure, brest plate & habirioun." Only after these images have been added does Christ say he will be the reader's "Trusty champioun / Whan ye beholde this dolerous pite." While the link between Christ as champion and Christ as the Man of Sorrows might seem awkward and infelicitous to modern readers, the incorporation of the shield image facilitates a fluid transition from image to text and suggests Lydgate's poetic technique of layering image upon image, text upon text. Just as Lydgate layers pieces of armor on the initial image of the "pavis" in order to transform the picture, so too does his poetic making rely on textual and figural layering. The move to representing Christ as conqueror is simultaneously a move to the realm of the textual; the Christ-knight image is a poetic and homiletic image and not easily translated into a visual form.[93]

In the next segment of the poem, Lydgate superimposes additional layers of figural imagery onto the "dolerous pite." The image of Christ, now identified as the "Trusty champioun," exhorts the reader:

> Beth not rekles when ye forby passe,
> Of myn Image devoutly taketh heede,
> Nat for my-silf, but for your trespace
> In Bosra steyned of purpil al my [weede].
>
> (25–28)[94]

By having the image instruct its viewer to pay attention to it "Nat for my-silf, but for your trespace," Lydgate again emphasizes that devotional images should not prompt intimate identification with Christ, but rather should remind their viewers how their "trespace" has caused their alienation from Christ and their need for reconciliation. This reconciliation is explained by the introduction of another Christological figure: the "mystic wine press" suggested by figural readings of Isaiah, 63.[95] Lydgate also draws on this image in his translation of the hymn "Vexilla regis prodeunt" where he again collapses the images of conqueror and mystic wine press:

> Royal Banerys vnrolled of the kyng
> Towarde his Batayle, in Bosra steyned reede,
> The Crosse his standart Celestyal of schynyng
> Wyth purple Hewe depeynt, I tooke good heede.
>
> (1–4)[96]

Christ marches into battle to redeem his people with his blood-painted cross as his resplendent standard proclaiming his preordained victory, its red and purple hues prefiguring the Eucharistic conflation of blood and wine.

In "The Dolerous Pyte," however, Lydgate exploits the figural potential of the Eucharistic allusions of this image, adding to the image of the conquering Christ a typological reference to the Passion derived from Numbers, 13. This biblical account of spies sent to Canaan who brought back a cluster of grapes hanging from a pole to demonstrate the abundance of the Promised Land became a widely recognized figure of Christ hanging on the cross.[97] Christ is figured as the "tendre clustris" of grapes that will be crushed to appease the wrath of God. Indeed, Lydgate's Christ describes the crushing of the grapes in some of the most striking lines of poetry in the sequence:

> The vyne of Soreth railed in lengthe & brede,
> The tendre clustris rent doun in ther rage,

> The ripe grapis ther licour did out shede,
> With bloody dropis bespreynt was my visage
>
> (33–36)

This image of the tender clusters of grapes further complicates the *imago pietatis* by recalling and re-imaging the Eucharistic element latent in the initial image of the wounds of Christ. Although the figure of the "mystic wine press" was common in hymns and sermons, it was much rarer in the visual arts of the period. It is possible that Lydgate might have encountered a visual depiction of the mystic wine press in his years in France, but in any case, he certainly would have been familiar with its figural implications from textual sources.[98]

Lydgate does not linger on the agony of Christ bearing "the bront allone of this ventage" (39), but rather returns to the realm of the textual and nonvisual in the sixth stanza by turning once again to the image of Christ as knight:

> My deth of deth hadde þe victorye,
> Fauht with Sathan a myhty strong batayl,
> Grave this trivmphe depe in your memorie,
> Lik þe pellican perced myn Entrayl,
> Myn herte blood maad abrood to rayl,
> Best restoratif geyn old Inyquyte,
> My platys seuered, to-torn myn aventail,
> Lik as witnesseth this dolorous pite.
>
> (41–48)

This is the dominant representation of Christ in Lydgate's corpus: the knightly king-warrior who has battled Satan and death and triumphed, thus attaining redemption for his followers/subjects. As in his *Life of Saint Alban and Saint Amphibal*, where the model of *imitatio christi* is the knight who is able to overcome and destroy idols, thus purifying his nation and leading many to the Christian faith, here Christ is a triumphant champion and restorer of righteousness "abroad" (far and wide). He is not a localized, regional king and champion; rather, his triumph sets him as authority over and restorer of all nations.

As we can see, Lydgate's religious lyrics do not conform to the affective model, though they certainly bear affinities to it. Over the course of the poem, Lydgate replaces the Man of Sorrows and "dolorous pite" with the pre-Bernardine image of Christ the champion. Though he initially asked readers to "Enprente" the image of Christ's wounds in their inward sight, he brings his poem to a close by asking them to "Grave this *trivmphe* depe in your memorie" (my emphasis) just as Christ's own side was engraved

with the pelican-like lance.[99] The act of piercing Christ's body becomes a metaphor for a translation from images to texts, for writing on the memory. Thus the poem comes full circle, returning to insistence on memory and allusion to its tools: the lance (the metaphorical pen) and the blood (the ink). Inscribing the image in texts enables the reader to experience the full typological resonance of "remembraunce of Crystys passioun" (55) and mediates the image's affective power. Lydgate's choice of layering heterogeneous and nonvisual depictions of Christ suggests that his version of the *imago pietatis* is not intended to produce weeping or passionate identification; rather it seeks to arm its reader/viewer for spiritual battle by drawing on a series of loose figural associations normally restricted to religious texts and derived from scriptural exegesis.

It is also telling that the poem does not represent the image itself as speaking but rather represents Christ as instructing the "viewer" of the image how to read it from *outside* the image. His is a disembodied voice, speaking of a representation of himself without speaking from the vantage point of the image. The image itself is dead and voiceless. The literary effect of Christ's disembodied voice is a widening of the psychological distance between the reader and the image. For Lydgate, an encounter with a material image must not be interpreted as an encounter with the person depicted by the image. The image is to serve only as a "goostly merour" (7).[100] Lydgate maintains distance by framing his complaint in the more objective refrain "Whan ye beholde this dolerous pite" (24). The verses themselves show Christ discussing his passion in the first person. But by referring the reader to "this" pity instead of "my" pity, Lydgate suggests an awareness of the importance of not giving voice and agency to "dead" images.

After this complex layering of images over the initial *imago pietatis*, Lydgate concludes the poem with a stanza that reasserts his deference to the traditional use of the image by versifying the indulgence that was frequently attached to it:

> From yow avoideth slouthe & necclygence,
> With contrit herte seith, meekly knelyng doun,
> O Pater-noster and Auees in sentence,
> A crede folwyng, seyd with devossioun,
> xxvi thousand yeeris of pardoun,
> Over xxx dayes, ye may the lettre see,
> In remembraunce of Crystys passioun
> Knelyng be-fore this dolorous pite.
>
> (49–56)

As Endres has noted, indulgences such as this often circulated with or were attached to the *imago pietatis*.[101] Lollard critiques of images highlighted

their association with extravagant indulgences such as this one. It is perhaps in light of these critiques that this final stanza is attached as a direct appeal to ecclesiastical and documentary authority ("ye may the lettre see") – the image is efficacious when accompanied by the prescribed observances because it has been given value by the church. On the one hand, reading the image through the lens of the indulgence is a much less imaginative and a much more reductive way of "seeing" than the complex layers of figures and histories in the previous stanzas. On the other, concluding with such an explicit reference to an ecclesiastical document also throws into relief the poem's latent insistence on textuality and suggests the increasing importance of texts in mediating and reforming lay religious practice in the fifteenth century. In sum, while Lydgate's poems on the pietà and *imago pietatis* never explicitly address the period's debates surrounding religious images, in their carefully constructed *amplificatio*, their resistance to prompting a purely affective response, and their insistence on maintaining the complexity of figural hermeneutics, they suggest a reformist alternative to both heterodox literalism and iconoclasm and dangerously subjective forms of affective piety.

ENGRAVING THE HEART: LYDGATE'S DOCUMENTS

Along with a resistance to the affect of visual culture, despite his apparent reliance on it, Lydgate's poetry is also marked by a turn to documentary culture, and particularly to documents related to ecclesiastical uses. In other words, Lydgate's religious lyrics call upon the regulatory power of both actual and metaphorical documents to provide an alternative to the atemporal and affective aesthetic of images. Lydgate's poetry is filled with charters, bills, pardons, and indulgences, and culminates in a literary last will and testament obsessed with its own textuality. Within lyrics such as Lydgate's, the appearance of documents, as Emily Steiner has argued, "constitute[s] a poetic theory" by calling attention to how "poetic form emerges from – or is revealed by – the interplay of discourses."[102] Lydgate's lyrics engage with their surrounding documentary culture on both levels: they call attention to their own status as texts and they employ documentary metaphors to negotiate the relationship between poetic aesthetics and the juridical discourses of the extra-textual world.[103]

Such self-referential textuality and allusion to documentary forms contributes to Lydgate's reformist aesthetics, providing him with a set of powerful metaphors for characterizing the relations between the visual and the textual.[104] In this final section, I consider the ways in which the sisterhood of the visual and textual arts becomes a site of competition

in Lydgate's religious lyrics rather than one of cooperation. Ultimately, I argue that Lydgate's manipulation of the permeable boundaries between images and texts facilitates clerical regulation of visual culture. But Lydgate also undermines this regulatory role by modeling a generalized *translatio* that challenges not only barriers between images and texts, but also between cleric and lay worshipper, memory and history, idol and icon, and Latin and English. It is precisely this permeability of boundaries that Lydgate attempts to contain by enclosing images within explanatory and historicized texts. Yet Lydgate's legacy is in part a reversal of this strategy of containment and contextualization – a number of his texts become material images on painted walls and wall-hangings, which when excerpted and generalized for public consumption ultimately participate in the versions of visual piety Lydgate sought to reform by them.

As we have seen, both images and texts are, for Lydgate, material memorials linked by their common ability to prompt "remembrance" and function as instructional aids when interpreted properly. Lydgate, perhaps spurred by the example of Deguileville, also draws on legal documents to suggest the relations between authority, textuality, and the material artifact.[105] Lydgate's association of the rhetoric of documentary culture with the redemption of mankind is not a novel one. Indeed, his self-proclaimed "maistere Chaucer" used a legal symbol to describe the redemptive work of Christ in his translation of a Marian prayer from Deguileville's *Pèlerinage*, writing that "with his precious blood he wrot the bille / Upon the crois as general acquitaunce."[106] This self-conscious insistence on textuality as a means of legitimization takes a number of forms in Lydgate's lyric poems, including the attachment of envoys defining the preceding poems variously as bills, *dites*, compilations, treatises, and tables, and the metaphorical use of documents within the texts themselves.[107] The envoy to the poem "Cristes Passioun," for example, commands the poem:

> Go, lytel bylle, with al humylyte
> Hang affore Iesu, that list for man to bleede,
> To-fore his cros pray folk that shal the see,
> Onys aday this compleynt ffor to reede.[108]

The envoy itself calls attention to the poem's status as a visual document, insistent on both its own materiality and its textuality. The text is a material "bylle" that must be hung beside the image as an instructive guide in right reading.[109] Although Lydgate uses "bylle" as a general term for a document, his decision to characterize a devotional lyric on Christ's Passion by a term often used within legal discourse is significant.

A "bylle" is often a formal contractual or petitionary document, though it may also be a message or letter.[110] Lydgate's use of the term throughout his corpus frequently suggests both senses. As demonstrated by its use here, it is sometimes linked with the genre of complaint since bills were often the formal declarations of defendants in court cases or formal written petitions to higher authorities. Lydgate's allusion to his poem as "bylle" suggests all of these meanings and, in doing so, seeks to legitimize a didactic religious lyric as an authoritative document.

These legitimizing efforts are not entirely reliant on the poem taking the form of an actual "bylle." Lydgate's envoys often represent the attached lyrics as metaphorical documents to be written on the reader's memory or heart. For example, the envoy to Lydgate's "Prayer upon the Cross" suggests that the words of the poem be written on a table and then hung in front of one's heart: "Kom to scole, recorde weell this lessoun … Why did I this? to saue the from prisoun; / Afforn thyn herte hang this lytel table."[111] The reader becomes clerk, scholar, and scrivener recording a lesson to be displayed on a table or a writing tablet.[112] Lydgate asks the reader to conceptualize the poem as a physical object that memorializes the redemptive act that saved the reader from "prisoun." Again we see Lydgate associating a material document with a legal process, in this case Christ's suffering "deth to paye [the] raunsoun" (2) of humans, who in return are asked to repay "Love for love by iust convencyoun" (15). In this poem, Lydgate appropriates documentary discourse to locate the understanding of salvation in a discourse of legal exchange rather than one of suffering and love-longing. As he moves toward the conclusion of the poem, Lydgate instructs the reader: "Rolle vp this mater, grave it in þi resoun" (21). Here again, he emphasizes the status of the poem as a text that is both material and memorial and as a document shaped as much by the discourse of juridical culture as by the language of devotional piety.

It is not only the envoys that suggest the complex relation between documents and images in these poems. Internal allusions to charters, manuscript pages, writing, and reading abound in poems purportedly describing images. Lydgate's lyric "The Fifteen Ooes of Christ" is an extended prayer to Christ, remembering his sorrows. In the poem, Lydgate's Christ prays to the Father, "O Fader myn, graunt of thy goodnesse, / Translate thys Chalys of my passyoun!"[113] This Eucharistic translation is mirrored by Lydgate's vernacular translation of the fifteen Ooes out of Latin into versified English.[114] Lydgate's poem, like the "Chalys," becomes the container of Christ's Passion and the memorial artifact upon which are imprinted and engraved the "tokenys of [his] peynfull passioun" (66). Christ's blood

is the ink with which the words of the Passion are written on the petitioner's heart:

> Mercyful Iesu! of grace do adverte
> With thilke lycour wich þou dedyst bleede,
> By remembraunce to write hem in myn herte
> Ech day onys that I may hem reede,
> Close þe capytallys vnder þi purpil weede
> With offte thynkyng on thy bloody fface,
> Thorugh myn entraylles let þi passioun sprede,
> Marked tho karectys whan I shal hens passe.
>
> (281–88)

The stigmata that Lydgate seeks here are internal texts, inscribed in blood on the heart and meant to be read daily. Lydgate's "karectys" are simultaneously scars and symbols, wounds and writing.[115] The conflation of flesh and text, of the image of Christ's face and the "karectys" engraved on the penitent's heart, culminates in an appropriation of the image of the charter of Christ.[116] Lydgate's allusion to Christ's sealing of the charter at the conclusion of the poem also situates it in a larger discussion of modes of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and forms of authority:

> Cleymyng by mercy to haue possessioun
> With al thy seyntys in the hevenly mansioun,
> Only by tytyll cleymed by thy blood,
> And by thy modrys meek medyacyoun,
> The charter asselid whan þou heeng on þe Rood.
>
> (332–36)

This charter promises an inheritance of property – through Christ's mercy, the petitioner will share possession of "the hevenly mansioun" with all the saints.[117] Lydgate's charter, as in the Middle English *Charters of Christ* and Herebert's "Þou wommon boute uere," is ultimately the legally binding document of Christ's body that has been sealed with his blood.[118] His use of the metaphor of the charter of Christ to conclude the poem again suggests that his understanding of Christ's salvific work is one of legal exchange. This legal model of interpreting salvation history (though a bit outdated by the fifteenth century) offers a powerful alternative to contemporary affective soteriologies. Lydgate finds in juridical discourse a mode of regulating affective experience.

While Lydgate's short lyrics evince an interest in the legitimizing possibilities inherent in appeals to documentary culture, it is in Lydgate's longer "Testament" that these scattered allusions come to fruition.[119] James Simpson has suggested that "the Testament presents itself as a complex

document, inserted into an intensely documentary, textual culture … [and is] very self-conscious of its documentary status."[120] Clearly early readers appreciated the poem's emphasis on textuality as well. Pynson's 1520 printing, for example, opens with a frontispiece of a woodcut of a very bookish Lydgate in his scriptorium. In this rather conventional scriptorium image, Lydgate is virtually surrounded by books: he is writing on a table with a book perched above him, a book leans on the other side of the table, another is found on the floor, and another rests on a table in the background. But the very conventionality of the image brings into focus the bookishness of Lydgate's literary production. His poem is the product of productive reading, of the assimilation of a diverse array of texts. Indeed, although the poem is framed as a juridical document or confession, it draws on a surprising variety of literary genres, ranging from the legal and bureaucratic to the confessional, devotional, allegorical, and exemplary. Lydgate's poem employs this generic bricolage to meditate on the workings of repentance and conversion and on the relationship of personal, moral history to typological and exemplary historiographies. Lydgate's "Testament" is heterogeneous in its depiction of salvation history, representing it simultaneously as a particular past known by memory and as a generalized, exemplary past culled from the books of history. Thus, in the "Testament," presumably one of Lydgate's final poems, we see perhaps the clearest example in Lydgate's corpus of his reformist aesthetics.[121]

Modern scholars have found Lydgate's "Testament" to be one of the most touching and accessible of his poems precisely because of this insistence on the particularity of personal memory.[122] However, even the opening lines of the poem suggest that Lydgate's "autobiography" is more generalized *exemplum* than personal testimony. To emphasize the exemplarity of his poem, Lydgate calls upon the witness of the legend of Ignatius:

> Marter Ignacius can beren therof witnesse,
> Amyd whos herte, be grace whiche is dyvyne,
> With Aureat letteres As gold that dyd shyne,
> His herte was graven, men may his legende se, –
> To teche alle cristen here hedes to enclyne
> To blyssed Iesu, and bowe adovn ther kne.
>
> (35–40)

Lydgate's story is an *exemplum* in the vein of Ignatius, written in "Aureat letteres" of a different sort. Ignatius' heart is represented as an illuminated manuscript page, engraved with shining, golden letters, for an audience to see, read, and be instructed by. Lydgate's poem serves the same purpose of bearing witness and teaching "alle cristen here hedes to enclyne";

it is not, as is so often supposed, the personal account of a conversion, but rather a traditional, exemplary text, such as the reader would find written in "Aureat letteres" in many didactic manuscripts.[123] The poem highlights its textuality in numerous other ways as well. For example, Lydgate uses an acrostic to expose the textuality of the name of Christ. This poetic wordplay comes at the conclusion of a meditation on the power and protection of the name of Christ. By breaking the name into letters, Lydgate acknowledges the textuality of his subject and reconstitutes the efficacious name as a potentially divisible text able to be read, reconceived, and rewritten in multiple forms (169–92).[124]

While the poem is concerned, in general terms, with its own status as text, it works out an understanding of that textuality by direct and frequent play on the forms of documentation suggested by the titular reference to both confession and the legal will.[125] After Lydgate completes his introductory invocations to exemplary narratives and the name of Christ, he begins to draw on legal language to situate his confession rhetorically. He begins by naming the poem as a last will and its executor as Jesus: "this hoolly myn entent, / To make Iesu to be chief surveiour, / Of my laste wille sette in my testament" (210–12). After an acknowledgement of Christ's bureaucratic role in the imagined legal proceedings, Lydgate moves between genres once again but continues to draw on documentary metaphors as his persona enters into an allegorical narrative. Lydgate explains that as Age calls him closer to the grave, he must make a "rekenyng how I my tyme haue spent" (218) and unless Jesus provides him guidance, "Ouerstreite audite is like tencombre me" (222). As Lydgate meditates on these things, he is visited by the allegorical companions of "croked Age" (254). Regret, allegorized as the sister of "remembraunce of myspent tyme," gives Lydgate a "wooful bylle" (274) detailing his wrongdoing. As he lies alone, considering the contents of the bill, he reflects on the seasons of life and moves into an extended nature description (276–390). Lydgate uses the seasonal framework of the description to prompt recollection, which eventually leads him to repent and confess that he "Stode onbrydeled of al gouernaunce" (403). Though a description of seasonal change seems an unlikely manner of concluding a section so structured by juridical discourse, it serves as both a mnemonic aid and, in its concluding allusion to "gouernaunce," a suggestion that earthly governance, as mediated by documents, is a reflection of the divine governance of the natural world. The digression also emphasizes the textuality of the poem. As Lydgate moves between genres, the transitions often come unexpectedly and jar the reader's awareness of the textual status of the poem he or she is reading. Simpson finds

this generic fragmentation to imply "a problem of narrative," suggesting that the multiple generic false starts are endemic of Lydgate's own brokenness.[126] I would like to suggest, conversely, that the juxtaposition of genres is a model of poetic display and play, intended to highlight the relationships between various forms of texts.

Although Lydgate's "Testament" revels in its intergeneric textuality, his rhetorical and generic manipulations ultimately culminate in a visual image. After recounting his childhood sins, Lydgate concludes with a description of his (or his persona's) moment of internal conversion. He explains that as a youth he had a visual experience when

> depicte vpon a wall,
> I savgh a crucifyx, whos woundes were not smalle,
> With this [word] "vide," wrete there besyde,
> "Behold my mekenesse, O child, and leve thy pryde."
>
> The which word, whan I did vndirstond,
> In my last age takyng the sentence,
> Theron remembryng, my penne I toke in honde,
> Gan to wryte with humble reuerence,
> On this word, "vide," with humble diligence,
> In remembraunce of Crystes passioun,
> This litel dite, this compilacioun.
>
> (743–53)

At first glance, Lydgate's encounter with the crucifix is comparable to other contemporary conversion accounts. The story of Saint Francis' conversion while praying in front of a crucifix circulated widely in both images and texts.[127] The visions of Julian of Norwich also were prompted by the image of a crucifix held over her as she was given the death rites.[128] Although Julian's cross is not an instance of conversion, it is the foundational image on which her sixteen visions related to the Passion and love of Christ are based. In both of these cases, images are not simply memorials or didactic devices; they are material artifacts that mediate an encounter with the divine.

Lydgate's experience with the crucifix has a rather different effect, in part because the experience is not merely prompted by the visual image but also by the inscription that accompanies it. Lydgate clearly indicates that it is the word "vide," not the crucifix itself, which spurs the meditation. The image's title enables the poet to see the error of his childhood sins and move in humility toward repentance. Appropriately, the poet's response to the image–text combination is literary production in the form of a further explanation of the image with repeated insistence on the

"vide," now translated as "Behold." Simpson reads the final section of the poem as an attempt by Lydgate to "undo" the documentary status of his "Testament" by vivifying the image he encountered and folding "his life back into an image."[129] Lydgate's "Testament," however, can only bring an image to life by transforming it into text. It does so by assuming the form of the most conventional complaint from the cross found in Lydgate's canon of religious writing. This complaint does not issue from the image Lydgate encountered and does not attempt to explain it. Despite its exhortations to "Behold," it does not refer to any particular, visualizable image, but instead to the textual body of Christ being produced in the poem itself. In other words, what the reader is asked to behold, in fact, is the Passion narrative.

Although Lydgate is prompted to write by the observance of an image and its inscription, he is subsumed by the poetic textualization of that image, or to reverse Simpson's formulation, his life, including his visual conversion experience, is folded back into a text. Each stanza asks the reader to "Behold" another moment of the Passion sequence: Judas' betrayal in the garden, the presentation before Caiaphas, Pilate, and Herod, the weeping women, the five wounds, the disciples fleeing. Rosemary Woolf finds this complaint almost entirely traditional but remarks that the "most curious and 'unpoetic' feature of the poem is that the recurrent exhortation 'behold' is followed not by sustained narrative description, but by mere enumeration of disjointed details."[130] This is Lydgate's poetic *modus operandi* in his lyrics about religious images; the details, however, are less disjointed than they might appear on a first reading and, when considered in light of Lydgate's interest in the relationship of images and texts, suggest his careful mediation of documentary and visual discourses.

Yet as we have noted, Simpson sees this shift as an "undoing" of the documentary culture in which the poem participates and a return to visual experience; he writes that "the fact that Christ is made visually present implies both that the recounting of Lydgate's past has become redundant, and that the documentary status of his text is entirely overborne by the dramatic, present, *seen* experience of the popular image."[131] What Simpson fails to consider, however, is that Lydgate's textualizing of the image in fact reasserts the primacy of text rather than reverting to an affective visual experience. When Lydgate takes his pen in hand and begins "to wryte with humble reuerence, / On this word, 'vide,'" he models the textual and historical mediation of visual experience through the creation of distance and the focus on history that we also see at work in his shorter lyrics on religious images. He does not describe the image, but rather situates it in

a historically informed narrative so that the reader might "Emprente thes thynges in thyn inward thought, / And graue hem depe in thy remembraunce, / Thynke on hem [wel], and forgete hem nowght" (874–76). Just as the love of Christ has been engraved in aureate letters on the heart of Ignatius, Lydgate's Christ asks readers to engrave his words, not his image, in their memory. In sum, Lydgate's "Testament," while purporting to be a memorial and visual exercise, ultimately inscribes itself within the jurisdiction of history and textuality. Lydgate's experience is entirely mediated and constructed by a heterogeneous compilation of texts, and the "autobiography" represented in the will is a textual representation of a life structured by self-conscious textuality.

READING THE WRITING ON THE WALLS: LYDGATE'S LEGACY

The poem's insistence on its own textuality is further highlighted in its circulation and devotional use after Lydgate's death. While purporting to translate a visual experience into poetry, Lydgate's poem itself is translated into a highly ambivalent visual object when it is painted on scrolls running around the cornice of John Clopton's chantry chapel at Long Melford at the end of the fifteenth century.[132] The selective excerpts of the "Testament" reveal the period's preference for writings that prompt affective devotion but also foreshadow the role that increasing lay literacy will play in the supplantation of visual devotional experience by religious experience mediated by texts in the Reformation.

When the church at Long Melford was rebuilt by the Bury monks between 1445 and 1496, thirty-two stanzas of Lydgate's verse from two poems, "Quis dabit meo capiti fontem lacrimarum?" and the "Testament," were painted on the walls of the chapel.[133] At one time black-letter inscriptions appear to have covered the whole wall space of the chapel (though now they are only visible in a few places, after having been covered in whitewash). The "Testament" verses are painted in black script on wooden plaques carved to look like scrolls that run around the chapel just below the ceiling. The plaques are connected by a "carved running pattern of interlaced branches, leaves, and flowers."[134] Likewise, the "Quis dabit meo" verses are painted in black script, directly on the beam supporting the lower ceiling in the west end. They are preceded by a small painting of a hooded female penitent (likely Mary Magdalene, the speaker of the poem). Both texts are adapted for the purpose and fragmentary.

Although the scrolls highlight the textuality of the fragments of the "Testament," their selective excerpting of the most affective moments of

the poem and their generalizing of the particularity of the authorial voice ("I" becomes "we") ultimately transform the poem into a more typical example of the period's visual and affective piety. As Gail Gibson notes, these verses have been "carefully chosen for their chantry setting" and thus primarily include selections from the final part of the poem (Christ's complaint) and the prayer to Christ for mercy in the third section.[135] For example, on the scroll on the cornice directly above the altar, where there likely would have once been a crucifix or *imago pietatis*, is written the first stanza of the fifth section of Lydgate's "Testament":

> Behold o man lefte up thyn eye & see
> What mortall peyne I suffred for your trespace
> With pitous voys I creye and seye to the
> Behold my wounds behold myn blody face
> Behold the rebukis þat doth me so manace.[136]

This stanza, when understood in the context of the entire poem, initiates a series of mental, intellectual, and even textual images. Yet when it is isolated from its textual context and translated back into the physical world it has an entirely different effect. It now is a pointer to a real devotional object and urges an emotional response to that image. The next scroll continues this emphasis on the "pitous voys" and love of Christ:

> Behold my love & geve me youre ageyn
> Behold I deied your ransion for to paye
> See how my herte open brode and pleyne
> Your gostly enimyes only to affray.[137]

What is important here is what has been left out. The stanza directly above the altar is the one hundred and first stanza of the original poem; this stanza is the one hundred and fourteenth. The intermediary stanzas, as I have noted above, generate a narrative of the Passion that is not easily visualized. The textual accretion of commands to "behold" the brief descriptions of the Passion narrative are omitted from the wall paintings, and instead the "pitous voys" of Christ meekly beseeches the reader: "Behold my loue & geve me youre ageyn." The practical effect of these omissions is to make the lyric more suitable for personal identification and affective devotional practice. The unabridged poem "provides hardly any emotional stimulus to undertake or sustain a meditation, nor any guidance to the visual imagination."[138] The abridgement and the lyric's probable proximity to devotional images remedy these issues. Similarly, while the decision to truncate the poem by omitting intermediary stanzas may have been one of simple necessity (as there was only limited space on the wall),

the excerpting of specific stanzas that create an abstracted, affective scene, as we have already noted, is consistent with the trend in the late Middle Ages of preferring images of single, atemporal moments from the lives of Christ and the Virgin over sequential or narrative images.[139]

Although we might assume that relevant images did accompany this text when the chapel was first constructed, the fact that the lyrics come to serve as decorative and textual images in their own right within fifty years of Lydgate's death is also significant. Trapp notes that "this particular modification of the technique, *tituli* without pictures, is extremely rare until at least the sixteenth century."[140] I would like to suggest that the existence of these English "*tituli* without pictures" is a marker of increasing lay literacy and reliance on the textual as well as the visual for religious instruction. The representation of the poem on scrolls reflects the emergence of a culture informed and regulated as much by documents as by images and anticipates the replacement of church images with scriptural texts in the English Reformation. In 1552, around fifty years after Lydgate's imageless *tituli* were inscribed on scrolls in the Clopton Chapel, the archbishop of York requested the replacement of the images at York Minster with verses of scripture.[141] The Reformation Injunctions containing this command are characterized by extreme anxiety about the regulation of both ecclesiastical power and lay piety. In the Injunctions, religious images are consistently characterized as the sources of superstition and idolatry. Conversely, the public display of a specified selection of religious books and texts is mandated.[142] While a similar suspicion of images was found in heterodox texts in Lydgate's own period, an interest in the regulatory power of vernacular texts was emerging in the orthodox religious sector.[143] For example, the use of vernacular texts as means of regulating lay devotion is implied in the ecclesiastical legislation initiated by Archbishop Arundel between 1407 and 1409 to counter and censor potentially subversive "vernacular theology," particularly that of Lollard writers.

Although Lydgate's "Testament" is indeed conveying "vernacular theology," it would likely have passed by the censors without much notice, given its status as a clerically produced text free from any direct vernacular quotation of scripture. Additionally, its excerpted form in the Clopton Chapel is especially innocuous given that its interest is more devotional than intellectual. Unlike many sixteenth-century religious texts, both Love's *Mirror* and the version of Lydgate's "Testament" in the Clopton Chapel remain reliant on the reader's ability to visualize and identify with the images described. Yet as a rare example of vernacular religious "*tituli* without pictures," Lydgate's "Testament" is an

unsuspecting harbinger of a world in which texts will usurp the privileged place of images in lay devotional practice.

Douglas Gray notes that, prior to the Reformation, examples of these "plain" verse *tituli* are most commonly found in the form of morality verses used as epitaphs and are often very short, macaronic verses.[144] Much more common in the vernacular are didactic secular verses painted on decorated panels. Lydgate's "Testament" is not alone in its translation into visual text. Manuscript rubrics suggest that a number of Lydgate's poems were preserved as visual artifacts on the walls or tapestries of churches or wealthy homes. For example, the rubrics in the versions of "Bycorne and Chichevache" found in Cambridge, Trinity College, MSS R.3.19 and R.3.20 indicate the poem is to be painted in a parlor or a hall.[145] While there are numerous courtly and didactic "picture poems" throughout Lydgate's canon that were translated from manuscript page to public image, I conclude by returning to one of Lydgate's poems that undergoes a series of suggestive translations between image and text and material object and manuscript page.

As I have already noted, Lydgate's poem *Danse Macabre* is a "translation" from a French wall painting that he viewed while in Paris in 1426. The introductory lines emphasize this original context:

> Considereth this ȝe folkes that ben wyse
> And hit enprenteth in ȝowre memorialle
> Like the exawmple whiche that at Parise
> I fownde depicte ones on a walle
> Ful notably as I reherce shal
> Ther of frensshe clerkes takyng aqueyntaunce
> I toke on me to translaten al
> Owte of the frensshe Macabrees daunce.
>
> (Ellesmere MS, 17–24)[146]

In 1430 at the request of John Carpenter, Lydgate revised the poem so that it might be retranslated into visual form and painted on the cloister walls at St. Paul's Cathedral. Yet the poem presumably made yet another translation, from painted wall back to manuscript page, before the destruction of the cloister in April of 1549 at the command of the Duke of Somerset. In the case of the *Danse Macabre* this translation is especially revealing, as manuscript evidence suggests scribal confusion about Lydgate's constant play with the relationship between texts and images. As we have seen, this play is evident in the frequent mixing of metaphors from images, manuscripts, and legal texts in his writing on images. It is also evident in later scribal variation and substitution to increase the clarity of the relationship

between Lydgate's poems and religious images. For example, the conclud-
ing stanzas of Lydgate's poem in the Ellesmere manuscript read:

> ʒe folke that loken vpon this purtrature
> Beholdyng here alle the estates daunce
> Seeth what ʒe ben & what is ʒowre nature
> Mete vnto wormes not elles yn substaunce
> And haue this myrroure euer yn remembraunce.
>
> (633–37)

However, the parallel stanza in the Lansdowne manuscript reads as
follows:

> Ye folk that loken vpon this scripture
> Conceyveth heer that al estatis daunce
> Seth what ye be & what is your nature
> Mete vnto wormys nat ellis in substaunce
> And have this myrrour ay in remembraunce.
>
> (Lansdowne MS, 561–65)

Explicitly visual references have been systematically changed to textual
equivalents: "purtrature" becomes "scripture"; "Beholdyng" becomes
"conceyveth." Thus, even the transmission of the poem attests to
Lydgate's commitment to exploring the "borderlands of image and text."
The Lansdowne manuscript's insistence on its status as text is again high-
lighted in the final stanza of the poem:

> Be nat a-fferd this scriptur in tyme of pley
> In your mynde to revolve & reede …
> Ther-fore a-mong have mynde on this lettir
> And vse vertu, prayer & almesse deede
> And that I dar sey ye shal doon the bettir.
>
> (Lansdowne MS, lines 577–78, 582–84)

Lydgate's sometimes ambiguous phrasing of imprinting "this" on one's
mind is finally defined explicitly as text here: "this scriptur" and "this
lettir" are to be read in one's mind. It is difficult, of course, to say if this
is an addition by a sixteenth-century scribe more interested in the role
of internalized words than images or if it is an articulation of Lydgate's
own insistence on the textual status of his work, but regardless, it points
to the ambiguity between visual and textual representation inherent in
Lydgate's poetry.

The refrain "Behold and se" often indicates such sites of aesthetic
ambiguity and cultural ambivalence in Lydgate's writing. These poems,
it has been my claim, both reveal Lydgate's interest in the relationships

between images and texts and suggest a larger set of cultural negotiations between forms of lay piety mediated by visual and sacramental signs and an emerging literate piety deriving its authority from texts. Efforts by sixteenth-century reformers to replace religious images with texts relied on the physical concealment of image-covered church walls with whitewash. Unlike this radical erasure, Lydgate attempts to re-form images with poetry. His poems return time and again to call attention to the inherent ambiguity of visual signs and to instruct their readers in proper and improper responses to these signs. While Lydgate's poems never explicitly address the Lollard critique of images, in their carefully constructed *amplificatio*, their resistance to prompting a purely affective response, and their authorizing use of metaphorical documents, they suggest a reformist attempt to correct the misuse of images through vernacular poetics. The lyrics seek to control the emphasis on phenomenal experience inherent in the period's "incarnational aesthetic" by modeling how traditional referential aesthetics more typical of Latin exegesis and homiletics might be translated into the vernacular. Although he is concerned with maintaining historically grounded modes of authority, it is also clear that Lydgate can read the (visual) writing on the wall and sees it as his prophetic responsibility to translate it for an increasingly literate lay audience.

John Capgrave's material memorials

> Inhabited by the uncanniness that it seeks, history imposes its law
> upon the faraway places that it conquers when it fosters the illusion
> that it is bringing them back to life.
>
> Michel de Certeau, *The Writing of History*[1]

Thus far, the Lollard charge that improper veneration of Christian images is a form of idolatry has remained largely in the background of my discussion of fifteenth-century reformations of the image. Discussions of idolatry in the fifteenth century are often limited to either the ancient idolaters of history, hagiography, and sermon *exempla*, or the foreign idolaters of romance and travel narratives. Idolatry is thus temporally or spatially removed, and the idolater is necessarily the other.[2] Whereas these discussions of idolatry often attempt to draw strict lines between pagan idols and Christian images so as to avoid any confusion, John Capgrave's writing suggests that these lines are much finer and more fluid than many of his orthodox contemporaries represented them to be.[3] Although Capgrave never directly addresses the charge that Christian image veneration may be idolatry, his representation of the ancient veneration of idols raises a host of related questions: What is the relationship between Christian images and idols? If Christian images are to be read as *libri laicorum*, then how should pre-Christian images be interpreted? Are idols ontologically different from images? Are they "books of error" (as one Lollard claims of images)? Or are they simply "nothing" (as orthodox and heterodox alike suggest)?

This chapter takes up these questions and argues that at the heart of Capgrave's representation of idolatry lies not only a concern about the sometimes opaque and duplicitous forms that embody memory but also a commitment to historicizing form. Insofar as it holds forth the illusory promise of re-presenting something absent, the figure of the idol suggests for Capgrave the difficulties of negotiating the demands that the past makes on the present. Thus, on the question of image use, Capgrave, like

Lydgate, is interested in questions of affect and temporality – how images construct relationships between the viewing subject and the representation of the past. But Capgrave neither explicitly appeals to nor explores the traditional justification of images as *libri laicorum*. Instead, he examines the affective role that both idols and images play in the maintenance of memory and the ways in which historical perspective (and specifically that provided by books) enables discernment between lawful image use and idolatry.

Like other reformist writers this book considers, Capgrave (1393–1464) was a cleric, intellectual, and administrator.[4] He spent much of his life in East Anglia: he attended the University of Cambridge (at the time, a bastion of conservative orthodoxy) from *c*. 1422 to *c*. 1426 and eventually settled at the Augustinian priory in Lynn. Between 1427 and 1439 we have little evidence of Capgrave's whereabouts, but during this time he produced over a dozen Latin commentaries, including commentaries on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, Genesis, and Exodus (which survive), and many other Old Testament books (which are lost).[5] By the 1440s he lived at the Augustinian priory in Lynn and was writing vernacular hagiographies, beginning with *The Life of Saint Norbert* (*c*. 1440). While he was working on his *Life of Saint Katherine* (*c*. 1446), Capgrave was promoted to prior at Lynn. In 1453, he was appointed Prior Provincial of the English Augustinians. As this brief résumé of his *vita* might suggest, Capgrave is not a likely candidate to be promulgating "radical" theological ideas in vernacular religious texts.

Yet his works reveal him to be, to borrow the phrase of a modern-day theological movement, committed to "radical orthodoxy."[6] What makes his positions radical is, perhaps paradoxically, their extreme conservatism.[7] Capgrave has, of course, long been seen as a fundamentally conservative writer, as representing a "last burst of bloom from a withered stock."[8] While it may be that Capgrave's work is fundamentally nostalgic, I would like to suggest that it is a *productive* nostalgia; his is a conservatism that seeks new paths in old stories. His writing is conservative insofar as it is interested in modes of preserving the past and in the material and textual media that embody cultural memory. But it is also radical insofar as it unabashedly articulates traditional Christian arguments about idolatry in vernacular poetry in the face of heterodox appropriation of anti-image rhetoric. In a period in which many ancient Christian practices had become altered (or in the view of some reformers and dissidents, corrupted), Capgrave encourages reform by providing history and hagiography, by representing saints who lived simply and preached truly, who

argued against clerical endowment and the misuse of images. But if his reformist positions sometimes seem to resemble those of the Lollards, we must tread carefully in claiming any doctrinal affinities between the anti-heresy reformer and heterodox polemicists. Apparent similarities come, I would suggest, from a parallel effort to reform church practice through the recuperation of the practices and doctrines of the early church. But while Lollard writers find their central authorities in the scriptures, Capgrave, like many other orthodox clerics advocating reform, turns first to ecclesiastical history and tradition as textual authorities for his models of reform.[9] And where many Lollards reject ecclesiastical trad-ition, Capgrave advocates scrutinizing the origin and development of that tradition.[10] Thus historical inquiry and history writing are, for Capgrave, necessary foundations for reform and safeguards against heresy.[11]

This chapter explores the ways in which Capgrave's reformist approach to the image is informed by his interest in the forms memory takes. My discussion will consider Capgrave's *Life of Saint Katherine*, which repre-sents the most complex articulation of Capgrave's reformism, but also two less familiar vernacular works by Capgrave: *The Solace of Pilgrims* (1449), a travel guide for the medieval pilgrim to Rome, and Capgrave's final work, *The Abbreuiacion of Chronicles* (1461), a condensed universal history. Taken together, these texts reveal the consistency and complexity of Capgrave's understanding of image use in his own time and in the pre-Christian past. To this end, I begin with a consideration of Capgrave's representation of pre-Christian memorial images in his *Abbreuiacion*. By historicizing idol-atry, Capgrave distances idol worship from contemporary image vener-ation. However, he also implies that memorial images – be they pagan or Christian – are dangerously opaque signifiers. Because simulacra obscure both their origins and their status as *made* and because they re-present the past, it is the responsibility of clerics to historicize (and thus demystify) the genealogy and ontology of the object. The second part of the chapter turns to the representation of idolatry in *The Life of Saint Katherine*, focusing first on Capgrave's commitment to providing historical context for the *Life* and second on Katherine's commitment to exposing the historical lineage of idols. In the third section, I read the supersessionist logic that structures Capgrave's *Solace of Pilgrims* as further evidence of his understanding of the essential differences between idols and images and of the importance of historical awareness in delineating that difference. In sum, as each of these texts suggests, for Capgrave the demystification of images and idols is best accomplished by the writing of and reflection on history. And so, while Capgrave does not explicitly address the heterodox critique of images, he

suggests time and again that to read images one must, as Fredric Jameson proclaimed, "always historicize," or as Capgrave's Katherine puts it: "Rede in your boke, loke in her lynage."[12]

IDOLS OF THE PAST: HISTORY, EUHEMERISM, AND CAPGRAVE'S *ABBREUIACION OF CHRONICLES*

Capgrave most explicitly describes the "lynage" of idols in his *Abbreuiacion of Chronicles*, a compendious world history completed around 1462 and dedicated to King Edward. Ostensibly his final book, the *Abbreuiacion* suggests the importance Capgrave places on historical understanding and shows Capgrave identifying himself as a sacred historian, a mantle he assumes just as consistently if less conspicuously in his other writing. This section briefly considers the functions and forms of medieval historiography, but focuses on Capgrave's representation of the pagan idol in his *Abbreuiacion* as both a container of memory and a historically contained and interpretable phenomenon. Insofar as Capgrave reads the idol as a material repository of the past, his text itself is the idol's unlikely mirror. Like the idol, historiography seeks to embody, give voice to, and thus in a sense resuscitate the past.

Medieval historical writing has been maligned by modern scholars who have often cast the Middle Ages as lacking historical awareness, as a period of "diachronic innocence."[13] Further, such critics express disdain for the extent to which medieval history writing is often didactic, exemplary, and moralizing, and frequently fails to distinguish between fact and fiction.[14] These, of course, are some of the same criticisms lodged against medieval hagiography. Although they are not often discussed as related genres, hagiography is not far from historiography in the medieval world.[15] Both sacred and secular histories rendered the past as exemplary or "emblematic."[16] Both history and hagiography, that is, served an illustrative purpose for many medieval writers, who looked for meaning and models for the social present in the stories and figures of the distant past, and who used saints' lives, in particular, "as vehicles for historical reflection."[17] But this mode of reading and writing history does not necessarily flatten out historical difference. To the contrary, as Capgrave's writings show, medieval history writing is often committed to calling attention to historical difference, even as it seeks temporal continuity.

Capgrave's commitment to history and hagiography as modes of reflection on the continuities and discontinuities between past and present may well be indebted to Lydgate's influence.[18] Throughout his poetic corpus,

Lydgate insists that writers play an important role in maintaining "trewe" cultural memory. In the prologue to the *Troy Book*, for example, he describes writers as makers who preserve the truth in their texts:

> For ner[e] writers, al wer out of mynde,
> Nat story only, but of nature and kynde
> The trewe knowyng schulde haue gon to wrak …
> But thoruȝ writyng þei be refresched newe,
> Of oure auncetrys left to vs by-hynde;
> To make a merour only to oure mynde,
> To seen eche thing trewly as it was,
> More bryȝt and clere þan in any glas.[19]

Lydgate insists that writers bear an ethical responsibility to both past and present. It is the duty of books to tell the truth of the past "without[e] feynynge" (Prologue, 178). Later in the prologue, Lydgate chastises Homer, Virgil, and Ovid for veiling the truth with falsehood: "Ovide also poetycally hath closyd / Falshede with trouthe, þat makeþ men ennosed / To whiche parte þat þei schal hem holde" (Prologue, 299–301). Where ancient poetry conceals truth, the late medieval cleric must reveal it.[20] Clerics can both translate and "enlumyne" (Prologue, 362) their books by drawing out the "trewe" history, imposing a schema of moral edification or allegorization on the secular text, and amplifying and embellishing their source.[21] Thus, the clerical poet is a moral maker and a truth-teller.[22]

   Although Capgrave does not articulate these aims as explicitly as does Lydgate, his commitment to history writing as a mode of clarifying truth is evident throughout his extant writings.[23] Moreover, Capgrave reads the past through a distinctively Augustinian lens: his *Abbreuiacion* is structured largely by biblical time and draws on a providential, Augustinian philosophy of history.[24] The universal history begins in the Garden of Eden in "Anno Mundi 1" and concludes in England in 1417. While the first and second parts (up to about AD 1212) maintain a degree of scholarly distance, the third part, with its intensified focus on England, implies a *translatio imperii* from Israel and the early Christian church to the late medieval English church.[25] There is not a great deal of difference, Capgrave's account seems to suggest, between the church fathers and his contemporaries who are striving to maintain orthodoxy in the face of proliferating heterodox sects and ideas. Throughout the *Abbreuiacion*, national identity is bound up with religious identity, and the ancient setting comes to serve "as a metaphoric field on which the self-projections of the medieval world were displayed."[26] For this reason, it is noteworthy that the *Abbreuiacion*

reflects Capgrave's special interest in political and religious dissent.[27] Although Capgrave's history generally shortens rather than expands its sources, it lingers on moments of ecclesiastic division and debate, and often pauses to describe early heresies and heretical movements.[28] These expansions reflect Capgrave's fascination with the problems of maintaining religious unity and evaluating religious dissent, problems that were, of course, endemic to his own period.[29] And strikingly, Capgrave insists that heresy is better countered with education than persecution.[30]

Unsurprisingly, this commitment to historicizing heresy inflects Capgrave's treatment of image use (both pagan and Christian, heretical and orthodox) throughout the chronicle. When describing the origin of idolatry, he begins by speaking in the most general of terms: "There were certeyn strong men and rich, makeres of townes, edifieres of citees, in whos name, whan þei were ded, þe puple edified ymages to her liknes, þat þei mite haue sum solace of þo similitudes" (20/28–31). His subsequent explanation will become increasingly specific, but he first offers a broad overview of the euhemerist theory of the origin of idolatry: images were originally constructed as memorials and shrines, as modes of consolation. Euhemerism, the standard Christian mode of discrediting pagan idolatry throughout the Middle Ages, finds its biblical source text in the fourteenth chapter of the Book of Wisdom:

For by the vain glory of men [idols] entered into the world, and therefore shall they come shortly to an end. For a father afflicted with untimely mourning, when he hath made an image of his child soon taken away, now honoured him as a god, which was then a dead man, and delivered to those that were under him ceremonies and sacrifices. Thus in process of time an ungodly custom grown strong was kept as a law, and graven images were worshipped by the commandments of kings. (14:14–16)[31]

The narrative is a simple one: a child dies; his father constructs a memorial image; over the course of time, the memorial use of the image gives way to its worship, and the dead child is remembered as a god rather than a human. Augustine expanded upon this explanation in *The City of God*, emphasizing that all pagan religion begins in ancestor-worship.[32] The euhemerist explanation gained wider circulation through the fifth-century mythographer Fulgentius (and John Ridewall's *Fulgentius metaforalis* in the fourteenth century).[33] Isidore of Seville similarly emphasized euhemerism in his argument against pagan deities as "fabulous figments."[34] Although these accounts sometimes diverge on the details of the first idol and idolaters, they similarly locate the origin of idolatry in a material memorial that was improperly understood and consequently

worshipped.[35] Euhemerism thus associates the similitude with memory; the idol promises to preserve memory but in fact obscures it.

But of course the idol has a history before it is worshipped. As Capgrave suggests, even divergent accounts of idolatry acknowledge that the idol always begins with neutral materials. Yet it is the nature of the idol to obscure these physical origins:

The Jewis sey þat Ismael mad first swech maumentis of erde, and compelled Ysaac, his brothir, to worchip þe same. The hethen men sey þat on Promotheus he mad first of erde ymages of men, and of him cam al þat craft of maumentrie; and for þis cause þe poetes feyned þat he was þe first maker of men, for he mad first swech similitudes. The Grekis sey þat on Cicrops began þis ydolatrie with grauing ymages in olyue-tre, and Minerue was þe first þat he mad, which is goddesse of cunnyng, for in hir name was þe cite of Attenes mad; summe sey he mad first Jupitir and set him on a auter. (21/2–12)

Capgrave here gestures toward multiple myths of origin, giving each version its say before setting forth what he sees as "þe treuhest opinion in þis mater" (21/13). What these narratives of origin have in common is their insistence on the "earthly" beginnings of idols and idolatry. The first image was made by putting the natural world – specifically the earth or olive trees – to unnatural uses. Clay is shaped into "maumentis" and "similitudes"; wood becomes graven images. There is no inherent divinity in these graven gods. They are made objects and their makers are identifiable. But Capgrave is less interested in the construction and materials of idols than in their use. As he will explain in the following lines, the "treuhest opinion" is the euhemerist explanation: idolatry is founded in ancestor worship, in the improper veneration of material memorials.

Euhemerism provides a narrative about the power of representation but also about the forms of collective memory and authority. As John Daniel Cooke suggests in an overview of the topic, the euhemerist argument begins with the making of images but also provides further explication of how those images could continue to be misunderstood by their ancient audiences. Euhemerism is based on the idea that:

(1) mankind had been deceived by poets and myth-makers who had fabricated the stories of their deification and potency; or (2) the so-called gods had come to possess or exert actual power (a) through the intervention of demons and satanic influence, or (b) through the identity or alignment of the pagan gods with the planets of the same name.[36]

As Cooke implies, many discussions of euhemerism did not represent the original slippage from commemoration to deification and veneration

as sufficient cause for the transformation of a unique occurrence into a widespread religious practice. The veneration of memorial images does not explain, after all, the understanding of the images as gods or planets, or the miracles and powers that came to be associated with the shrines. Thus, further explanation was needed. This came by ascribing agency to artists (poets, myth-makers, and sometimes the image-makers themselves) and to demons who were thought to inhabit and animate the empty forms provided by the simulacra.

Many of these themes are evident in Capgrave's account, which draws primarily on Fulgentius' version: "There was a rich man in Egipte, whos name was Cyrophanes, whech had a son whom he loued ouirwel. This son deied in ȝong age, and whan he was ded, he lete make a ymage lich him and set it in his hous, þat he mite dayly haue a newe rememberauns" (21/14–18). For this grieving father who wants a "newe rememberauns" every day, the simulacrum initially serves as a mode of refreshing memory. Although the statue stands in for the lost son, it does more than simply memorialize him: it obscures the opposition of presence and absence, and in so doing prolongs and defers the process of mourning. But, as we have seen, the prolonging of memory and production of affect are two of the central justifications for Christian images, and ones that Capgrave apparently accepts as valid. In his *Life of Saint Norbert*, Capgrave offers a similar description of the translation of Norbert's body to St. Mary's Church "where his breþerin dwelle." The body is laid in the choir before the altar, in order to memorialize him: "Thei þouȝt it was encresyng to here feith / And eke enhaunsyng to here religioun / Euery day of his graue to haue a visioun."[37] Here, as elsewhere in his corpus, Capgrave acknowledges that the desire for physical memorials of absent persons – be they relics or representations – is neither inherently sinful nor limited to pagan antiquity and idol worship. But even as Capgrave seems to endorse the translation of Norbert's relics, he maintains some distance from the enshrinement, ascribing the memorial impulse to others. In other words, he maintains an ambivalent stance toward memorial objects.

As Capgrave's representations of both the pagan idol and Saint Norbert's shrine suggest, commemorative images promise to make memory *last*. They promise to transcend not only human death, but also time itself. But such promises are always illusory. As Aranye Fradenburg has suggested, the idol can only represent a "fantasy of durability."[38] Capgrave's Katherine herself will point out this illusion, disparaging Maxentius' offer to commemorate her with an image:

> Loo, swech a guerdon I may now purchace,
> That men shuld dredyn and foules shuld defyle!
> But whan deth hath shake on us his blast,
> And that oure mynd be passed a lytyl whyle,
> I am aferd this werke shall not last –
> Wherfor to make it me thinkyth but a wast.
>
> <div align="right">(v.476–81)</div>

In the following lines Katherine further emphasizes the image's transitory materiality: not only will birds and dogs defile it, but even children playing in its shadow are liable to make a mess of the object (v.484–88). Katherine's sarcasm demystifies the memorial image, situating it firmly in the material and temporal realm and emphasizing its susceptibility to ruin and destruction.[39]

While Capgrave may depict the production of memorial images as potentially misguided and the re-presentation of an absent person as dangerously duplicitous, he never implies that material memorials necessarily lead to idolatry. Rather, idolatry arises from improper use of those memorials. As Capgrave explains, commemorative objects became idols when "be temptacioun of þe deuel, [pagans] worchiped hem as goddis, and beleued þat þoo men whech were worchiped in þoo ymages were translate to heuene as goddis, and soo spirites ȝoue answere in hem as reuelaciones whech þe puple supposed þei com fro heuene" (20/31–21/2). Seeking some explanation of the miracles and "reuelaciones" associated with pagan idols, writers and theologians explained that demons inhabited the inanimate simulacra.[40] Unsurprisingly, this explanation was appropriated by at least one fifteenth-century critic of Christian images: Margery Baxter implies that the miracles that occur at shrines and images are the product of such malevolent presence.[41] Although Capgrave gestures toward this explanation, he notably does not engage with it in any more detail in the *Abbreuiacion* or in the extended critiques of idols in his *Life of Saint Katherine*.

More problematic than the production of mnemonic images or even their possible animation by demons, for Capgrave, is the human response to them. To this end, he emphasizes the danger of inordinate affection for the deceased. The father loves his son "ouirwel" – there is affective excess even before the material simulacrum enables the generation of more affect. Aquinas suggests as much in his entry on the origin of idolatry in the *Summa*, writing that idolatry arose "on account of [man's] inordinate affections, forasmuch as he gave other men divine honor, through either loving or revering them too much."[42] Fulgentius also emphasizes the

affective origins of idolatry. Nearly a millennium later, Ridewall followed
Fulgentius in reading idols as *forma doloris* – the material representation of
sorrow.[43] As Michael Camille argues, the idol promised to allay sorrow by
preserving "human existence and [defying] time through the stillness of
representation."[44] Thus the idol responds to and embodies sorrow, but it also
promises to alleviate it by providing the illusion of continuous presence.

   If the idol is marked by the promise of consolation through re-presen-
tation, it also is a material sign of the coercive power of tyrannical rulers.
The political valences of idolatry are implied in Capgrave's *Abbreuiacion*,
though are not as clear as in other medieval accounts of euhemerism.
However, as we will see, they are a central element of his representation of
idol worship in his *Life of Saint Katherine*. In the *Abbreuiacion*, Capgrave
paraphrases Fulgentius to explain that after the father has erected the
image, "þe seruauntis, for plesauns of her maistir, offered þerto garlondis
and lite. And whan ony of hem had offended greuosly þei fled to þe ymage
and þere were þei saf" (21/18–21). Fulgentius renders the offense more
clearly than does Capgrave, noting that the servants are worshipping the
image when they adorn it with garlands and candles. Moreover, the serv-
ants only attend to the image out of fear of their master or as an attempt
to flatter him. For this reason, as Capgrave notes in passing, idolatry can
be said to originate "be dreed" (21/23).[45] Although the servants initially
venerate the image out of fear, they eventually come to understand the
image as possessing agency or power, even if that power is only symbolic.
The servants' flight to the image in times of danger suggests that it no
longer serves its initial mnemonic purpose, but now is understood to have
protective powers. Again, the euhemerist explanation expresses concern
less with the construction of a memorial image than with the human
response to it. In other words, central to euhemerism is an understanding
of idolatry as a mode of response. Idolatry can only be demystified and
historicized, Capgrave seems to suggest, if we take into account the ori-
gins of the memorial objects, the purposes of their construction, and the
various responses they inspire.

   Even though euhemerism is primarily a mode of demystifying pagan
religion, it has the secondary effect of laying bare the slippage between
presentation and re-presentation, and thus the duplicity of re-presentation
more generally. As I have already suggested in passing, the euhemerist
explanation often implicates poets in the creation of idolatry. According
to many accounts (including Capgrave's), artisans and poets conspired to
conceal the origins of these material gods, obscuring the relation between
maker and made, between people and simulacra. One cannot miss the

irony that in late medieval England the euhemerist explanation is most often advanced by poets. John Gower alludes to euhemerism in his *Confessio Amantis*, noting that the father, Cirophanes, grieving over his son's death, decides to construct the "ferste ymage … in remembraunce. / A faire ymage of his semblance / And sette it in the market place."[46] In the beginning of the fifteenth century, Lydgate's *Troy Book* amplifies the discussion of idolatry from that of its source, Guido delle Colonne's thirteenth- century prose epic, *Historia destructionis troiae*, highlighting in particular the euhemerist argument (II.5480–940). In these expansions, Lydgate seeks to demonstrate that idolatry is a sin always anterior and exterior to orthodox Christian practice. To this end, he outlines a chronology of the development of idolatry. The description of origins that follows is, for the most part, a detailed rehearsal of the traditional euhemerist argument: idol worship is rooted in misdirected ancestor worship and inordinate affection for the absent person. As the first example of a memorial image worshipped as an idol, Lydgate cites the story of Nynys, who, mourning the loss of his father, constructed an image:

> be fals affeccioun,
> And sette it vp for consolacioun,
> And for a mynde and a memorial,
> Vn-to þe whiche, with hert[e], wil, and al,
> Of ygnoraunce and of fleschly love
> He dide honour, as to God above.
>
> (II.5529–34)

Moreover, Lydgate claims that this false memory based on misplaced affection ultimately led to an entire culture's fall. Lydgate's discussion also highlights the danger of setting up images as memorials, the possibility of misremembering or forgetting entirely their original meaning, and the capacity of these images to be abused and used to manipulate their devotees.

The late fifteenth-century allegorical dream vision, *The Assembly of Gods*, similarly offers a euhemerist explanation of the origins of idolatry, first explaining that the planets were called gods by "oold poetys."[47] Next the author explains that the gods were once humans (1703–08). The poem ascribes much of the blame for the ontological transformation to classical poets. It is because "poetys feynyd many a fable" (1686), and because "all poetys put undyr coverture / Of fable" (1723–24), that

> the rurall pepyll hit took
> Propyrly as acte, refusyng the fygure.
> Whyche errour som of hem never forsook.
> Oft a false myrrour deceyveth a mannys look,

> As thow mayst dayly prove at thyne ey.
> Thus were the paynyms desevyd generally.
>
>   (1724–29)[48]

This concern about dissimulation and about the animation of artifacts reflects larger anxieties about modes of embodying history that persisted in both Latin and vernacular writing throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Yet even as the author of *The Assembly of Gods* disparages the role of poets in blending *res factae* with *res fictae*, in rendering history as myth that is too easily misunderstood by "rurall pepyll," he (or she) recounts a mythology in Chaucerian rhyme royal. In so doing, the fifteenth-century writer becomes complicit in the blurring of the lines between history and myth, truth and falsehood, and, implicitly, between prose and poetry.[49]

    Thus, in many late medieval accounts of idolatry, anxiety about the inheritance and transmission of the past appears as anxiety about the *forms* that the past takes. Although they are usually considered more truthful than poetry, historical prose texts are, of course, among these forms. As I suggested in the opening of this section, we might read Capgrave's commitment to historical writing as a foil for the idol, as a parallel but less problematic vivification of the past. History writing animates objects and people in an attempt to speak into the present moment. It remembers the past.[50] Like the idol, history, as Michel de Certeau has put it, "fosters the illusion that it is bringing its [lost object] back to life."[51] But if the memorial image and the memorial text make similar promises, the idol obscures its genealogy – its status as made – and the clerically produced history makes that genealogy known. Capgrave's writing shows him to be intensely interested in both the analogous and divergent functions of memorial images and memorial texts. More specifically, for Capgrave, writing about pagan idolatry enables reflection on this relationship, but also on the relation between the past and present. To this end, we must note that in his *Abbreuiacion* Capgrave never allows readers to ignore or dissolve temporal difference. Even as he incarnates the past with words, he continues to emphasize its otherness and does not allow it to speak for itself. The chronicle form lacks voice and thus remains, for Capgrave, an inanimate relic.

idolatrous voices: negotiating the past in capgrave's *life of saint katherine*

Of course, Capgrave is not most well known for his prose history nor even for his Latin commentaries. His vernacular poetry, and specifically

his long verse *Life of Saint Katherine*, secured his reputation. Nonetheless, his poems evince the same concern about the forms of embodying "true" history as his *Abbreuiacion*. If the chronicle form insists on maintaining the past as past, its hagiographic cousin (through the animating force of narrative voice) enacts the past as presence. Indeed, much fifteenth-century hagiography, like the affective religious lyrics that I discussed in the previous chapter, encourages the use of the imagination to flatten historical distinctions. Like the imaginative re-enactments of biblical history encouraged by Nicholas Love, an early-fifteenth-century prose *Lyf of Seynt Katerine* calls upon readers to enter into scenes as if they were part of the narrative.[52] As Karen Winstead has argued, these rhetorical moves serve to render "the sublime familiar, even cozy."[53] Similarly, Capgrave's contemporary, and fellow Augustinian, Osbern Bokenham, opens his *Legendys of Hooly Wummen* with the explanation that the verse legends therein are intended "for to excyte / Mennys affeccyoun."[54]

   In his version of the *Life of Saint Katherine*, Capgrave articulates no such affective aims but rather calls upon his reader to exercise the intellect and consider the complex relations of past and present. Over the course of around 8,500 lines of English rhyme royal verse in five books, his *Life of Saint Katherine* recounts the story of the learned Katherine of Alexandria, her debates with philosophers (first over their demands that she marry, second over Maxentius' demands that she worship idols), her own conversion and spiritual marriage with Christ, her subsequent conversion of countless pagans, the miraculous destruction of the wheels built to torture her, and her martyrdom by sword. Capgrave goes to great lengths to historicize Katherine's *vita*; he frequently digresses to explain the historical or religious contexts that frame main narrative events. In so doing, he emphasizes the alterity of the pagan past, but also often (and sometimes jarringly) draws out continuities between the present and the past and calls attention to the ways in which the past inheres in the present. The *Life* thus shows Capgrave negotiating a more complicated set of temporalities but doing so with a continued stake in exploring the ways images (and more implicitly, books) embody memory and mediate the audience's relationship with the past.

   The saints themselves are, of course, already spiritual, temporal, and formal mediators.[55] As Sarah Salih has recently noted, they exist "at the join of textual and material cultures" in late medieval England.[56] Many studies have read saints' lives as a "catechetical tool much like the stained glass …. [they] depicted vivid tableaux, which communicated the Christian message unambiguously."[57] By the mid fifteenth century, however, many

vernacular hagiographies were riven with ambiguities – and some of these ambiguities strike at the widening fault line between images and texts as *libri laicorum*.[58] The iconoclastic Katherine herself became the subject of wall paintings, statues, manuscript miniatures, and an annual procession.[59] Yet Katherine's late medieval image was a material site resonant with the theological contestations of the image debates.[60] Scholars have not failed to note the irony of this reception of the legend of Katherine: a saint who is known for her rejection of images becomes one of the most popular devotional images of the fifteenth century. Because Capgrave gives his heroine an extended critique of idols and has the pagan philosophers voice defenses that sound a bit like those articulated by the fifteenth-century church, many readers of the *Life* have suggested that Capgrave is sympathetic to Lollard ideas about images.[61] Although he is clearly aware of the contemporary resonances of his historically displaced image debate, Capgrave, I will argue, evokes the pagan past not to blur the lines between pagan idols and Christian images, but to teach his readers first just how different these two media actually are and second that it is important to understand the historical context of any image. In the end, Capgrave's Katherine sounds much less like a fifteenth-century "stereotypical Lollard wife" than a fourth-century reader of Augustine.[62] In other words, by historicizing image use, Capgrave's *Life of Saint Katherine* not only delineates the differences between ancient pagan uses of images and contemporary Christian material memorials but also instructs its readers how to interpret images more generally.

Underlying much of Capgrave's discussion of the context of Katherine's *vita* and *passio* is his interest in euhemerism. Within the narrative, the ancient world is attempting to maintain (and make sense of) its own tenuous relation with the past, and the idol and book come to represent alternative modes of communicating and apprehending that past. But the writing of the *Life* itself also represents an attempt by Capgrave to make sense of the relations between ancient religious practices and fifteenth-century Christian practices. The tensions inherent in Capgrave's project are first apparent in the description of the death and burial of Katherine's father, King Costus, in the poem's first book. In this description, Capgrave refuses to provide details about pagan burial rituals, fearing that doing so might lead some astray. He explains that "mych other thyng / Was seyd and do, whech nedyth not to rehers, / For happyly summe folk myght than be the wers / To here swech maumentrye and swych maner rytes" (I.474–77). The king, Capgrave makes clear, is entombed as is fitting for royalty. He is anointed, embalmed, and apparently memorialized by

additional rituals (those mysterious "mych other thing [that] / Was seyd and do"). Yet Capgrave's moralistic evasion defeats its ostensible purpose, drawing attention to the mystery of "maumentrye and swych maner rytes" by refusing to describe them. Moreover, this passage implies that the beginnings of idol veneration are to be found in ancestor worship. As Capgrave notes in the following stanza, the nobles soon begin thinking about how to memorialize their departed leader: "thei seyd that her kyng / Mote hafe a memoryall for any maner thyng, / And that of swech lestyng whech schuld not fayle" (I.482–84). But Capgrave does not have the nobles erect a monument. Instead, he has them point out the memorial futility of material artifacts: "Thus seyd thei all ryght with oon entent. / Peyntyng and wrytyng and gravyng in entayle, / It wyll wanyse and wast, roten and be brent" (I.485–87). They suggest that memorial images are not as permanent as they seem. These pagans, unlike those that dominate the second half of the poem, resist the illusory allure of the memorial object. Instead of building a monument, the nobles decide to rename the city "Famagost" in honor of the departed king. Capgrave thus subtly avoids implicating Katherine's family in the euhemerist practices of their contemporaries.

All of this changes when the invading emperor, Maxentius, takes over the city. Capgrave devotes over a hundred lines of political and social history to establishing the context of Maxentius' arrival and rise to power (IV.78–196), punctuating his verse with appeals to textual authority ("as oure bokys telle," IV.78). In these lines, Capgrave details the rather complicated late third-century political context, describing the shared rule of the Roman empire by Maximinus Galerius, Maximian, and Diocletian and the subsequent events that led to Maxentius' rise to emperor of Rome. This context is not included in other versions of the *Life* and may at first seem an entirely unnecessary digression. However, it clearly is meant to reveal the (corrupt) character of Maxentius and to underscore the importance of genealogy and historical context. As Capgrave puts it, "Al this is told to this ende, sooth to say, / To know how Maxcens with soo grete aray / Cam to Alisaundre" (IV.193–95).

Immediately upon arriving, the emperor issues three edicts: he commands Christians to forsake their faith; he wages war against Constantine; and he renews the pagan ritual observances to the gods. This new rule is inaugurated by a sermon by the pagan bishop ("with mytere and with crose") against the newfangled religion that has turned away from the "elde rytes":

> "I wyll ye wetyn," he seyth, "that Jupiter that hye kyng
> Hath turned awey his good conservacye
> From all oure nacyon. I tell yow shortly why:

We have forsak him and fall in maumentrye.
Many of us here, I drede me, are gyltye
In this same matere. Wherfor, Jupiter allmyghtye
And Saturn his fadyr, be pryvy apparicyon
In slepe, gove warnyng be very revelacyoun.

Thei bode we schuld the puple teche to renewe
The held cerymonyes and the elde rytes
Whech oure fadres used or we anything knew,
And so used many lordes and many knytes.
Who geveth us helpe in pees or in fytys
But Jupiter alone? Helth evyr upon him,
Honour and servyse to him and to his kyn! …

Leve all this newe thingys, kepe styll your olde.
What, schall Cryst among goddys put Him in place?"

(iv.315–29, 337–38)

With the fire and brimstone panache of a puritan jeremiad, the bishop paints a picture of divine wrath and judgment, ascribing the city's loss of divine favor to the people's decreased devotion to the gods. The anachronistic representation of the pagan religious leader as a preaching bishop seems at first to undermine the temporal distinctions that Capgrave seeks to create throughout the narrative, but it throws into relief the complexity of the reader's relationship to the pagan past. It makes the past present and the present past. By temporarily eliding historical difference, it helps readers draw connections between the otherness of the pagan past and their own late medieval context.[63]

If the passage's anachronisms project the present onto the past, the bishop's sermon insists on the claims that the past makes on the present. In a formulation similar to Hoccleve's plea in the *Regiment of Princes* for heretics to return to traditional religion ("Oure goode fadres olde han folwed it," *RP*, 357), Capgrave's bishop encourages the people repeatedly to turn from the new to the old. His is a plea for recuperation, for historical continuity rather than rupture. This recuperation is met with seeming jubilation – music and dancing – by the people of the town. But Capgrave slyly juxtaposes the noise of celebration with the violent cries of death: "There was noyse of trumpys and noyse of men, / Mech more of bestys that deyd in her bloode" (iv.372–73). Even while people are celebrating, the butchers are busy, laboring "as thei had be wode" to slay sacrificial animals. Foreshadowing the imminent human sacrifice of Christians, the converted scholars, and Katherine herself, the river runs thick with blood.

Capgrave is quick to distinguish the differences between these rituals and Christian ones, first by calling attention to the violence of the animal sacrifice, second by noting that although the bishops go to the temple to preside over the service, "There was no matens seyd, servyse, ne pryme, / Thei had anodyr usage than I can devyse" (IV.381–82). Capgrave again feigns ignorance of pagan rites even as he gestures toward them and defines them against contemporary Christian practice. He carefully circumscribes his representation of the past, aware perhaps that re-presentation is only a short step away from restoration. And thus, as he describes the scene, he moves back and forth between description of the pagan past and containment of it. He continues to differentiate ancient religious practice from contemporary practice, noting for example how quick the people are to make their sacrifices to these idols, kneeling and crying "with marred devocioun" (IV.386). Insofar as he seeks to demythologize ancient religion, Capgrave's approach to this scenario is remarkably comparative and historicist.

Indeed, Capgrave is somewhat unconventional in his approach to representing pagan antiquity. Many of his clerical contemporaries moralized and allegorized the classical past to make it suitable for the moral instruction of late medieval audiences. In her influential study of the literary production of fourteenth-century English friars, Beryl Smalley notes that many of these "classicizing friars" employ short descriptions of pagan gods as visualizable *loci* for extensive moralization. In particular, the sermon *exempla* of John Ridewall and Robert Holcot present allegorical descriptions of pagan deities as if they are merely reporting ancient pieces of visual art as painted by the poets ("pingitur a poetis").[64] Yet, as Smalley notes, these are "sham-antiques"; once the initial image has been described, the "pictures" are moralized and allegorized; they are made instructive and palatable, in other words, for their medieval Christian audience.[65] Capgrave, however, avoids this exemplary, "picturing" mode even as he provides a very brief ekphrastic list of the idols being worshipped. He literalizes rather than allegorizes the images, providing only enough detail for iconographic identification:[66]

> The fyrst god of all, whech stod most hye,
> Was the bryth sunne with his hors and carte,
> Whech was i-grave of full sotyll art.
>
> Next was the mone, whech we clepe Diane,
> With hir wellis nyne and the maydenes eke.
> Next here was Saturne, with his bittir bane,
> With his sekyll in hand.

> (IV.390–96)

Calling his readers to see with their minds' eyes, Capgrave directs their vision around the walls of the temple, moving the readerly gaze from image to image, god to god. As Capgrave's descriptions suggest, a god might be a divinity, a planet, or a material representation of the divinity. If it is not immediately evident that Capgrave is describing a statue, he clarifies that the god described is made by human hands: it has been "i-grave of full sotyll art."[67]

Capgrave not only refuses to appropriate pagan deities for Christian moralization, he also casts judgment on them:

> The auter next him was ful well arayed
> On whech that Jubiter stode all on hye
> With his wyfe Juno ful well i-porterayed.
> Venus the fayre, sche stood next by,
> With hir blynd sone Cupide, so wene I.
> Thei calle him so that owe him servyse –
> I owe him non, for maumentrye I despyse.
>
> (iv.400–06)

The narratorial interjections are frequent in this section. Even as Capgrave describes the line-up of gods and comments on how "well arayed" and "well i-porterayed" they are, he distances himself from them, distinguishing his voice from the people "that owe him servyse" and strongly asserting that he despises "maumentrye." Although he claims that "mech more thing was there not to purpos nowe" (iv.407) he emphasizes again the violence of the ritual slaughter of animals ("Thei spared neythir hors, ox, bere, ne kowe, / But sle and sle") and the cacophony of the revelry and song (iv.409–10).

It is against this backdrop that we see the newly-converted Katherine, sitting alone in her study in "silens … All contemplatyff" (iv.430–31). When she hears the racket created by the renewal of the pagan rites, she asks her servant to explain its meaning. The servant reports that the emperor "hath comaunded to eld man and to faunt / The elde rythes, the servises, to restore, / Whech to the goddes long and have do yore" (iv.444–46). As in the bishop's sermon, Capgrave here associates the turn toward idols with the resurrection of "elde rythes" and thus with the desire for historical continuity. Other late medieval versions of the *Life of Saint Katherine* lack this emphasis on the renewal of traditional rituals.[68] Capgrave, however, frequently gestures toward the tension between old and new and between past and contemporary religious practices throughout his poem. The remainder of the poem represents Katherine negotiating the claims that the past makes on the present, by its material

manifestations but also by its textual remnants – her mode of argumenta-
tion is founded on the logic and books she studied before her conversion
despite her explicit rejection of her pre-Christian learning. From this first
description by the servant, Katherine cannot escape the inherence of the
past in the present.

This inherence is not always negative; Capgrave emphasizes that
Katherine's memory of her conversion and reading shapes her actions. Her
servant urges her, "Kepe stille youre closet; there is no more to sey. / It is
not oure powere his will for to breke" (IV.451–52). But Katherine, of course,
understands that "If she holde silens than is she not trewe / Of hir behestis"
(IV.499–500). Yet this understanding only comes after a period of reflec-
tion and "remembrauns." When Katherine hears the naysaying of her ser-
vant, "Sche gan remembyr" that the Virgin had prophesied such opposition
(IV.471). Then she "remembred what covenaunt that she made" in her bap-
tism and "wex she ruddy and fayre as a rose, / Rith in remembrauns of that
swete spousayle" (IV.484, 490–91). Finally, she gazes at her blue ring, the
material memorial of her wedding to Christ (IV.501–04). Her memories pro-
vide both solace and strength. Yet even though she is fortified by her mem-
ories, as she makes her way through the crowd to the temple to confront
Maxentius, "she hath forgote all thing" (IV.520). Presumably, Capgrave is
articulating Katherine's single-mindedness, but in a passage so structured
by "remembrauns," the aside is telling. Although there are, of course, mul-
tiple and competing pasts here, this entire passage suggests that Katherine
is as constrained by her spiritual history as Maxentius and the pagan
bishop are by their religious inheritances. Like them, she finds authority in
"remembrauns," but in order to act she must distance herself from it.

Thus, empowered by spiritual "remembrauns" and forgetful of every-
thing else, Katherine makes her way to the temple and begins her diatribe
against the restoration of the "elde rythes." In this initial confrontation
with Maxentius, she first articulates the iconoclastic arguments that she
will repeat in various versions throughout the remainder of the poem:

> How be thei goddys, these maumentys that we see?
> Rede in your boke, loke in her lynage,
> Than schall thu know that erdely as we bee
> Were thei sumtyme, for your Saturn, pardé,
> Was sumtyme kyng, as bokes telle, of Crete,
> And so was Jubiter, thus seyth youre poete.
>
> (IV.632–37)

Katherine's appeal to the written tradition here is striking. Capgrave dis-
tinguishes between the knowledge available in images and that available

in books. Quite simply, images obscure their "lynage" – their isolation from any narrative context makes them more difficult to "read" accurately. Books, on the other hand, reveal that lineage, and indeed are synonymous here with genealogy and history. What books reveal about images is the very human origins of the classical gods. Katherine here (and in much of her critique of idols) seems to be appropriating Augustine's arguments against idolatry. He similarly remarks in *The City of God* that "There is no difficulty in discovering the methods of pagan worship; we can easily see its infamy and degradation. But it would be hard to discover what, or whom, they worship if their own historians did not bear witness."[69] What is implicit in both accounts is the assumption that books are more reliable witnesses to the origins of images than are the images themselves.

Appealing to the euhemerist argument, Katherine reiterates that the gods were once "erdely as we bee." Saturn and Jupiter, her evidence for this argument, were once both kings. Further, they were *imperfect* humans, a point Katherine will elaborate in much greater detail in her later debate with the philosophers:

> Because thei myght not bothe in that lond acorde,
> Jubiter, the sun, made Saturn, his fader, to fle
> Ryght into Ytale, your bokes wyll it recorde,
> In whech tyme there thoo regned he
> Janus ye call with dobyll face, pardé,
> Because he lokyth to the elde yere and the new.
>
>   (iv.638–43)

The continued appeal to books in this passage should not be overlooked. Here as above, books convey knowledge more completely than images. Katherine represents books as reliable, authoritative sources of history whereas images are resolutely not. Indeed Katherine suggests that *if* Maxentius had read his books more carefully, he would not be so stubbornly wrong-headed about the nature of his gods. To emphasize this point, Katherine displays her superior knowledge of those books. First, she calls attention to the human backgrounds of the gods, focusing specifically on genealogy and geography – Jupiter and Saturn were members of the same dysfunctional family and can be linked to physical places. Second, she shows her understanding of the figural meanings of the images – Janus is the god of spatial and temporal liminality (of doors, windows, the juncture of endings and new beginnings) and thus is depicted with two faces, one peering into the past, the other toward the present. Although this brief reference is the only invocation of Janus in the poem, the god's "dobyll face" serves as an image for Katherine's understanding of all of the pagan

idols, which are characterized by their duplicity. Such duplicity is not, however, the main thrust of Katherine's critique at this point; instead she continues to emphasize the human origins of her opponents' gods. Although she never cites her sources, Katherine's argument here (and likely her interest in Janus) is quite bookish and Augustinian itself.[70]

Following Augustine, Katherine's argument relies on a set of distinctions between the created, physical, and temporal on the one hand, and the uncreated, spiritual, and eternal on the other. In Katherine's view, the pagan understanding of their gods (as both material and spiritual, both temporal and eternal) destabilizes these necessary oppositions. While the capacity of humans to become gods is clearly not problematic for Maxentius (indeed, he even offers the first step of deification to Katherine on two occasions in Capgrave's version of the poem), it provides an insurmountable logical conundrum for Katherine (who does not seem nearly as perplexed by the opposite movement of the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation).[71] The upward mobility of divinization troubles Katherine, whose understanding of the nature of divinity is fundamentally Aristotelian – only an unmoved mover, an unmade maker is worthy of her veneration (IV.1461). The "soth," she further explains, is

> That men thei were and are noght eterne.
> How schuld thei be goddys whan thei were made?
> It longyth to a godde to be sempyterne!
> Ful falsly the puple ye deceyve and glade.
> He is a Godd that may nevyr fayle ne fade,
> He is a Godd that mad all thing of nowte,
> He is a Godd of whom your goddys were wrowte.
>
> (IV.645–51)

This is the central question for Katherine: How can something be a god that is a created thing? The god's origin (be it as a human leader or as a created image) presupposes a prior, exterior, higher source. In other words, creation should not be elevated above its creator. The temporal should not be valued over the eternal that circumscribes it. The repetition with which this stanza concludes drives home these points, emphatically proclaiming the distance between Katherine's God and the material images being worshipped by Maxentius. The passage also alludes to another central problematic of pagan image veneration. Like we saw in Capgrave's discussion of idolatry in the *Abbreuiacion*, here too idols "glade," or comfort, the people, but even this comfort is deceptive. Again, Capgrave emphasizes the capacity of images to deceive, obscure their own histories, and promise a comfort that they simply cannot provide.

Maxentius does not respond directly to Katherine's critique (indeed, one of the oddities of the debates throughout the poem is how frequently speakers talk past each other, failing to respond to the critiques issued by their opponents), but rather points out logical inconsistencies in Christianity. He asks: How is it possible for a virgin to bear a child? How can one person's blood save others from their own sins? Katherine's reply is another evasion. She claims that she does not have the time to answer these questions and then issues a multi-stanza critique of the emperor's hermeneutic abilities, including the accusation:

> Ye take the barke, whech is open to the yye,
> Then ye fede you ryght in youre dotage.
> The swete frute whech withinne doth lye,
> Ye desyre it nought.
>
> <div align="right">(IV.687–90).</div>

Katherine here generalizes a metaphor often applied to the reading of figurative texts, applying it to Maxentius' inability to interpret the material and natural world properly. Moreover, just as Katherine insists on the eternal nature of God, here she insists on his invisibility, his hiddenness, in the natural world. Because the true God "Is not nowe visible among us here," Katherine explains, worshipping "stokkes" and "creatures" is a great heresy (IV.697–714). In short, idolatry begins with misreading; it is a misrecognition of signs.

Although Maxentius is not convinced by Katherine's arguments, many others who hear the debate are emboldened to reject the idols they had been venerating. Seeing how so many have "caute boldness" from Katherine's "sermone," Maxentius recasts the debate in more politicized terms, calling Katherine a traitor and a rebel. Katherine, in turn, appropriates this political discourse and re-theologizes it, arguing that all humans are "traytouris" to God when they "take awey fro Him that dew honour / That He shuld have" (IV.787–88). Katherine maintains that the issues at stake are fundamentally theological and philosophical. Maxentius understands the broader social and political implications of her insubordination: "Ageyn oure goddes is she and ageyn oure pees" (IV.810). As in Capgrave's euhemerist sources, he notes here that many in the crowds were venerating the images out of fear of Maxentius: "For peyne and deth had hem so i-feryd / Befor this tyme, that in all her observauns / Onto the goddes thei made but feyned plesauns" (IV.726–28). In this context, Katherine's refusal to venerate images stands in for resistance to coercive government; her intractability inspires others to be bolder but also threatens the social

and political hierarchies (of which the gods are a part). Her refusal to worship his gods is thus a direct affront to Maxentius' political authority.

Yet Maxentius, unlike those fifteenth-century leaders also attempting to stomp out heresy, recognizes that putting Katherine to death will not put an end to the doctrines she preaches (though, in his anger at the conversion of the philosophers, he will change his mind). More efficient, he decides, is to "oppresse" her with reason (iv.806–11). To this end, he puts the debate on hold so that he can summon "grete clerkis / Lerned in gramer, rethoricke, and philosophie" to "destroy this heresye" (iv.820–24). That heresy is best countered by learning is, as Karen Winstead has demonstrated, a foundational belief for Capgrave and also one that distinguishes him from many other religious leaders and writers in his own day.[72] Like his contemporary, Reginald Pecock, Capgrave believes that heresy can best be responded to on the shared ground of rationality and learning. But however conciliatorily Capgrave might look on the question of learning, his work is clearly devoted to the refutation of heresy. In the *Abbreuiacion*, for example, he both notes early heresies, such as "þe wikkid heresy of Arry" and the "Donatistes heresie" (61/27, 31), and lingers on examples of "þe fals chalenge of þe enmyes to þe Cherch" in his own time (226/23). Not surprisingly, Wyclif and his followers frequently come under Capgrave's censure in the *Abbreuiacion* for their "straunge opiniones" (181/7).

Katherine's opinions about the pagan gods may similarly strike her persecutors and her fifteenth-century readers as "straunge," but they are entirely orthodox, Augustinian critiques of pagan idolatry. Indeed, there are fewer points of confluence between Katherine's iconoclasm and Lollard polemics than modern critics have asserted. As we saw in the first chapter, there are multiple strands of the Lollard critique, but most of them hinge on concern about misrepresentation (images that are "ill-made" are potentially deceptive), misperception (the belief that the likenesses are anything more than "sticks and stones"), and ethics (the money spent on images would be better given to the "true" image of God: the poor). Although Katherine's critique of idols takes up the question of misperception, she is primarily concerned with exposing their origins as corrupt humans who are no more worthy now to be worshipped than they were when alive.[73] This becomes all the more evident in Katherine's debate with the fifty pagan philosophers, which focuses on the idol's obfuscation of the past, an obfuscation that both opens it up to the multiple interpretations of the philosophers and prevents the truth of its origins from being known (that is, without the aid of books).

Katherine begins the debate with a monologue in which she explains that she has "left all my auctores olde" (iv.1324). One by one, she bids farewell to these authorities – to Aristotle, Homer, Ovid, Aesculapius, Galen, and Plato – explaining that she has "a lessoun mech trewere to susteyne / And more directe to know creature" (iv.1340–41). Whereas the authorities of the pagans can treat only the transitory, what is observable within the constraints of nature, time, and human reason, she has turned to a source of knowledge that "Tretyth of thing whech evyr schall endure" (iv.1352). She concedes that the philosophers can comprehend everything that pertains to nature but argues that they are blinded to the supernatural and spiritual. In so doing, she effectively undermines the traditional epistemologies that would govern any argument made by the philosophers and refuses to argue on the basis of human knowledge. Yet, Katherine's seeming repudiation of her pre-Christian learning is not, in fact, an actual rejection of it. As we have already seen in her initial dispute with Maxentius, she still continues to rely on her classical learning even when she does not directly cite it. We might better describe Katherine's relationship with pagan learning in terms of development, accretion, and supersession.[74] The past, in other words, is not to be destroyed entirely, but rather, when possible, is to be appropriated, converted, and redeemed.

Capgrave's representation of the arguments for and against the idols is also governed by appropriation and selective preservation: when the philosophers articulate arguments that can rightfully apply to Christian images, Katherine notably does not dismantle the arguments themselves, but rather demonstrates why they cannot be applied to idols. The first philosopher, Astenes, is infuriated that he has been summoned to debate such lunacy and "elde errour" and argues primarily against the folly of the Incarnation and Resurrection before calling upon Maxentius to silence Katherine lest she lead the "lewyd folk" astray. Katherine takes this as an opportunity to reiterate the difference between the "Lord of hevene" and the pagan gods: "Jubiter was but a man; / No more was Saturn, whech his fadyr is" (iv.1463–64). Since the pagan gods have human origins, she suggests, religion should seek "Him whech befor this thing / Was evyr in heven" (iv.1467–68). As in her debate with Maxentius, she argues that only a god outside of time and human limitations is worthy of worship. On these same grounds she rejects the philosopher's implied comparison between pagan gods and the Christian God:

> Make no comparison betwyx your godd and myn,
> For my Godd hath made all thing of nowte,

> Eke your goddis are not so goode as swyn –
> Thei can not gruntyn whan hem ayleth owte!
>
> (IV.1478–81)

The next philosopher begins by conceding this point to Katherine (a rhetorical move reminiscent of the openings of academic dialogues taught in late medieval schools), restating Katherine's complaint that the images that are being worshiped "May not fele, ne hafe no powere" (IV.1498). Yet as he continues, he offers a more sophisticated reading of what the images mean:

> Thys wote I wele – thei be but figures
> Representyng othir manere thing.
> Lych to these fayre rych sepulcures
> Whech betokyn in her representyng
> That there is byryed duke or ellys kyng,
> So are these ymages toknes of goddis oure
> To whom we geve with hert gret honoure
> Not for her cause but for significacyoun
> Of the worthy whom thei represent.
>
> (IV.1499–1507)

Katherine herself has already implicitly acknowledged this argument in her discussion of Janus, but as several scholars have recently noted, this pagan philosopher's argument also sounds rather like those being set forth by the late medieval English church in response to Lollard critiques of images.[75] But while these arguments in Capgrave's fifteenth-century England may resonate with contemporary orthodox defenses of Christian images, they derive from the euhemerist argument and, more implicitly, the positions articulated by Varro and addressed by Augustine in *The City of God*.[76] According to this reading, idols are only signs, only representations, only memorials of something or someone absent. In this way they are like graves and sepulchers. Moreover, comparing images to sepulchers erected in memory of great leaders is only a short step away from explaining their use in terms of ancestor worship. And indeed, the philosopher concludes the argument with an appeal to the intent of the artisans: "Thei that made hem nevyr othir wyse ment / To sett hem up but for this cause only – / That to hyere devocyoun men schuld go therby" (IV.1510–12). The images, this disputant claims, were crafted only as memorial signs to stir devotion. Of course, the use of material memorials to stir devotion is not problematic in itself. As we have seen, it is one of the primary justifications for images in the late Middle Ages. Pauper explained to Dives, images "been ordeynyd to steryn mannys affeccioun and his herte to

deuocioun," and Capgrave himself uses similar language in his comment about the translation of the relics of Saint Norbert.[77]

At first glance, Katherine seems to ignore the philosopher's claim that images are "but figures," instead challenging the philosopher to show which god is the "worthyest" (iv.1514).[78] But if Katherine's response is not direct, her approach is quite telling: she again emphasizes the importance of knowing an image's history. While the philosopher's argument can legitimately apply to Christian images, for Capgrave, it cannot reasonably be applied to pagan idols, especially when their histories are made known. When the philosopher argues that the gods are memorials "Of the worthy whome thei represent," Katherine first asks if any of the gods are in fact worthy of veneration. She then calls attention to the human frailties of the gods, asking that her examiners demonstrate

> Of all these goddys whech that worthyest be.
> For as thei stande in your temple o rewe
> I can perceyve in hem no dyvynyté
> More in on than othyr, for your Saturn, pardé,
> Whyl that he lyved was a fals traytoure –
> Homycyde cruell, debatere and robboure.
>
> (iv.1514–19)

She exposes again the histories of the gods which have been obscured in the images and concludes, "These are your goddys wheche that ye honoure – / All to vyces sett was her laboure" (iv.1546–47).[79] Here we see Capgrave highlighting a crucial difference between idols and images of saints. Medieval images of Christian saints have *exemplary* value; the saint is to be remembered because of his or her virtues and to serve as a model for others. This argument simply cannot be made about pagan idols.

The final philosopher attempts a different tactic, promising to let Katherine in on "the most pryvy secre" about the gods: they are only allegories of planets and "natures whech that be eterne" (iv.1573, 1584). Thus Saturn is a representation of time, Jupiter a representation of fire, Juno a representation of air, and so on. Katherine, of course, already knows this "secre," having read about it in a book (iv.1592–94). In response, she asks, if the planets are not human, then why are they represented by human forms and "Why are thei grave thus of ston and of tre?" (iv.1612). Further, she asks, since even the planets are created, should not their creator be worshipped rather than the created thing? The problem, as she chided Maxentius before, is that the pagan philosophers "worchep the schadow and leve the substauns" (iv.1616). Again, Katherine's arguments mimic Augustine. In response to Varro's argument that idols represented celestial

bodies or abstract ideas, Augustine argues that "we worship God, not the sky and the earth, which are two elements of which this world consists … We worship God, who made the sky and the earth and everything that exists in them."[80] Katherine's articulation of this point finally convinces and converts the philosophers, who leave their "elde schole" for further instruction in the new, Augustinian learning articulated by Katherine.

Thus, as the debate with the philosophers suggests, Capgrave's *Life of Saint Katherine* calls attention to the importance of contextualizing idolatry, of remembering that idols began as material memorials, and of knowing what they memorialized. But of course, medieval images of saints are also memorials and thus also need to be historicized to be used well – a task that Capgrave himself never articulates but that he is modeling in the composition of his long, historical *Life of Saint Katherine*. Although both idols and images are material memorials, a closer inspection of their origins and uses reveals the divergent histories, affiliations, and responses they require of their audiences. With the help of the classical poets, idols hide their shady origins and assert themselves as deities rather than humans. With the help of late medieval "truth-telling" poets and historians, images represent the holy lives of saints and martyrs for their audiences.

Yet these distinctions are not unique to Capgrave. At the end of his discussion of pagan religion and idolatry in *The City of God*, Augustine provides a single chapter justifying the material commemoration of Christian martyrs. He explains this practice by reminding his readers that the martyrs

are not gods for us; their God is our God. We certainly honour the memory of our martyrs, as holy men of God … and by renewing their memory we encourage ourselves to emulate their crowns and palms of victory, calling upon God to help us. Thus all the acts of reverence which the devout perform at the shrines of the martyrs are acts of respect to their memory. They are not ceremonies or sacrifices to the dead as gods.[81]

Augustine continues at some length to distinguish Christian memorial practices from pagan ones. That he must do so suggests that there was already some confusion about what made pagan and Christian material memorials different from each other. I would suggest that Capgrave's *Life of Saint Katherine*, with its commitment to distinguishing the pagan past from the Christian present, is attempting to make the same sort of distinction. While Capgrave's readers might chuckle at Maxentius' promises to memorialize Katherine with an image, they would also know that the images they encounter of the saint are not containers for a deified martyr

but memorials and holy examples. But the fact that Capgrave so emphat-
ically historicizes his poem also suggests that he, like Augustine, recog-
nizes that readers sometimes need to be reminded of the humanity and
"lynage" of the saint. After all, if his own reading about pagan idols has
taught him anything, it is that images obscure their origins, their geneal-
ogy, and even their ontology, and for this reason carefully written sacred
history is necessary.

THE "CHAUNGYNG OF TEMPLES INTO CHIRCHIS": RENOVATION, APPROPRIATION, REFORMATION

If the lines between pagan idol and Christian image seem to be blurred
at points throughout the debate between Katherine and the philoso-
phers, they are quite clearly (and in fact, structurally) distinguished in
Capgrave's travel guide to Rome, *The Solace of Pilgrims*. Where Capgrave's
Abbreuaicion details the historical origins of pagan idols and his *Life of
Saint Katherine* implies that knowing the history of idolatry shows just
how different pagan images are from Christian ones, his *Solace* demon-
strates why historicizing material artifacts, including Christian images,
remains necessary for the late medieval Christian. A guide to the mater-
ial spaces and artifacts of Rome, the *Solace* is a handbook for the inter-
pretation of the city's sometimes ambiguous images. It provides their
genealogies and historical context – both their classical roots and their
contemporary Christian uses.

In so doing, the *Solace* depends on a narrative of material superses-
sion – where once there were pagan idols now there are Christian images.
In this model, Christian images are not only represented as ontologically
different from idols but also as a mode of appropriating and redeeming
the materials of idolatry. Capgrave insists again and again through-
out the *Solace* that the spaces and materials of ancient Rome have not
been destroyed but rather have been "put to better use." In other words,
Capgrave's representation of Rome is characterized by material accretion
rather than destruction.

Moreover, throughout the guide Capgrave both records inscriptions
and stories (gleaned from other authorities) and describes images and
places, emphasizing once again the extent to which images and writing
are parallel modes of memorializing for the Christian. In fact, he begins
on this point: "Many men in þis world aftyr her pilgrimage haue left
memoriales of swech þingis as þei haue herd and seyn þat nowt only here
eres schuld ber witnesse but eke her eyne."[82] Moreover, Capgrave admits

that some of the descriptions are based on "auctores" and others on what he saw "with eye."[83] His self-insertion here is an authorizing move – both seeing and reading, he suggests, are necessary for an accurate account and interpretation of the multiple, layered histories and material memorials of a place like Rome.[84] *The Solace of Pilgrims* is, one might say, a testament both to the power of artifacts in the construction of cultural memory and to the tension between the destruction of the past and its reform.[85]

The *Solace* is divided into two parts: the first, and shortest, declares "the disposicioun of rome fro his first makyng"; the second part offers a more leisurely description of "þe holynesse of þe same place fro his first crystendam" (2). Although the first half of the book describes pre-Christian Rome, even here Capgrave narrates a story of material supersession, of Christian monuments replacing Roman ones:

Owt at þe ȝate whech is cleped porta appia þere was sumtyme a temple of mars god of bataile and now is þer a fayr arche in whech is depeynted all þe story who our lord met with petir and seyde on to him þat he wold go to rome to be cruci-fied …. Thus þe temple of þe fals feyned god of batayle is turned on to a memor-ial of trewe fiteres for our lord ihu whech wold rather deye þan forsake his feith. | That place þat is now cleped custodia mamortini wher seynt petir was in prisoun was sumtyme a temple consecrat to jubiter. | That cherch whech is cleped seynt adrianes was sumtyme the temple of refuge þat is to sey who so euyr fled yertoo [sic] was saf þere. (21)

As Capgrave builds his then and now list, the replacements continue: the "temple of concorde" is now the Church of St. George; the temple of Vesta is now the Church of St. Maria Antiqua, and so on. Capgrave emphasizes that places of worship become places of memory and narrative; pagan temples become Christian memorials. For example, the temple of the god of battle is now painted with "all þe story" of Christ's appearance to Peter. Moreover, Capgrave implies a figurative link between the pagan edifice and its Christian replacement: the image of the "fals feyned" god of war is replaced with "trewe" warriors (Christian martyrs).

This sort of supersessionist logic, as Kathleen Biddick has pointed out, was central to typological modes of historiography in the period.[86] Yet, as James Simpson has argued, the material accretion and appropriation of the past implicit in accounts such as this is a fundamentally reformist move and morally preferable to the "revolutionary" penchant for destruc-tion and rupture with the past.[87] But just as Capgrave eschewed Christian moralization of pagan idols in his ekphrastic account of the temple in *The Life of Saint Katherine*, so too he resists any logic of simple assimila-tion in his account of the replacement of classical images with Christian

ones. Capgrave's account of Rome is one of appropriation and accretion but also one of historical rupture. The pagan shrines are supplanted by Christian memorials; idols are replaced by Christian images.

The "chaungyng of temples into chirchis" is, of course, better known from Gregory the Great's command that the heathen altars and temples of sixth-century Britain be converted into sanctuaries for the worship of "the true God."[88] But there are many late medieval accounts that also called attention to the replacement of idols with images. The *Speculum sacerdotale*, for example, explains how "the temple that was made for alle fals ydoles is nowe i-halowyd for alle holy seyntis. And where that the multitude of ydoles were i-worschipid is nowe loued and worschepid a multitude of holy seyntis."[89] This is the explicit subject of the *Solace*'s second book, which takes the reader on a tour of all of the holy sites of the city. Capgrave's interest lies specifically in material artifacts, in images and buildings, although much of ancient Rome has already been "distroyed eythir be conqwest of þe cite or ellis by chaunge on to bettir use" (27). In the fourteenth chapter, Capgrave provides both a description of the temple of Apollo and an etymological analysis of the god's name before noting that "seint siluester [caused] þis maunmentrie to be broke and spent in to betir use" (36). The "better use" to which Capgrave frequently gestures is simply analogous to Christian worship. Partial destruction of the past is necessary, in Capgrave's understanding of history, for progress.

Capgrave, like many of his contemporaries, finds the justification for such destruction in narratives of divine iconoclasm. The pivotal moment in the fall of the idols is the Incarnation of Christ, which literally breaks the monuments of the past, thus making room for the new order. Capgrave gestures toward the well-known story: "In þe natiuite of crist þei sey all þis brak and many oþir þingis in the cite to schewe þat þe lord of all lordes was come" (27). This passage locates iconoclasm at the heart of Christian supersession of pagan religion; some rupture with the past is necessary. The account of the fall of idols originates in the Apocryphal Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew and was, as Michael Camille has demonstrated, a common scene in the iconography of Christ's infancy.[90] But for Capgrave, the fall of idols, like the replacement of idols with images more generally, does not function as "a conquest that destroys its objects but as an architectural conversion that redeems them."[91]

When describing the various churches the medieval pilgrim would likely encounter in Rome, Capgrave continues to pay attention to material artifacts, describing images and books, but he also includes lengthy narrative and analysis of the legends surrounding the material artifacts,

providing context on the founding of the church or image, its use, and any miracles associated with the material memorial. In his description of the Church of St. Paul, for example, Capgrave notes both "a ful fayr ymage of crist hanging on þe crosse wheche ymage spak certeyn wordes on to seynt bryde whech tyme sche lay þere in contemplacion" that the pilgrim may view between the high altar and the altar of St. Benedict, and in the sacristy "þe same bible þat was seynt ieromes [which is a] fayr book … and a large and ful wel arayed" (67). Both image and book here are relics insofar as they were encountered by the saintly superstars who had used or encountered them in the past. In the Church of St. John Lateran, Capgrave describes images of the Virgin Mary on one pillar and an image of the angel Gabriel on another, as well as a miraculous image of Christ that "appered on to all þe puple of rome uisibile þe same day þat seynt syluester halowid þe church. And as þe elde stories sey it was neuyr mad with mannes hand but sodeynly þus it appered" (73).[92] Thus in recounting miracles associated with the various images and churches, Capgrave often maintains some distance, as he does in his description of miracles associated with Saint Katherine's shrine in the final lines of his *Life of Saint Katherine*, where he claims that he "will determyne no conclusion / As in this matere" (v.1975–76). But, more generally, in guiding the reader's experience of the images with the historical contextualization that the *Solace* provides, Capgrave provides the interpretation that his readers will need to understand the material memorials they encounter.

If we read the *Solace* as representing, as Summit has argued, a "historiography of conversion [that] effects change not through destruction but through selective preservation and calculated appropriation," we might also see this as a governing mode for Capgrave's other works.[93] As I have suggested throughout this chapter, one way that the past might be preserved is through the writing of history. Although the desire for "solace" motivates the construction of commemorative images, it also prompts the writing of history. Written history, like the image, provides not only information but also consolation. In his *Solace of Pilgrims*, Capgrave conceives of his travel guide as providing help or support in the travels of pilgrims.[94] In his *Abbreuiacion*, Capgrave's account of euhemerism begins with grieving people making "ymages to her liknes, þat þei mite haue sum solace of þo similitudes" (20/30–31). Moreover, Capgrave notes that he has written the *Abbreuiacion* itself for the "solace" that it will provide. As the preface explains, he is in the last years of his life and fears he will not be able to study as he once did. Yet, he writes, "it plesed me as for a solace to gader a schort remembrauns of elde stories, þat whanne I loke

upon hem and haue a schort touch of þe writyng I can sone dilate þe cir-cumstaunses" (7/12–15). The compilation emerges from Capgrave's schol-arly pleasure and consolation. *The Life of Saint Katherine* also represents reading as solace. In the prologue to the fourth book, Katherine models "the grete labour / That goode men have to rede exaumples olde, / It is to hem of solace newe socour / Her vertuous levyng stabyly to beholde" (iv.36–39). The beholding suggested here is that of the exemplary text, of the history or hagiography. In short, throughout his corpus Capgrave suggests that both images and historical writing function as memorials and both can provide consolation.

But material and textual memorials are not analogous signs for Capgrave. By his own production of vernacular histories and hagiographies, Capgrave implicitly acknowledges that even Christian material memorials might be misused or misunderstood and thus need narrative and historical con-texts. To put it another way, for Capgrave the late medieval other of the pagan idol is not merely the Christian image, it is also the written sacred history: both are memorials, both seek to embody and even vivify a now absent person, both seek to re-member the past. Sacred history thus func-tions as textual reliquary. Noting this resonance of material and textual memorials, Christopher Cannon has suggested that historical writing is

only useful (perhaps only extant) to the extent that its formal nature is denied; its constituting cause is the need to make any who meet it forget how it was made …. As a mode of knowing, history is truly formidable in its capacity to make what has vanished so vivacious that we feel we have not lost it – to make what has died away from the world live again in the richness of its former substance.[95]

For Capgrave, however, writing sacred history serves as a way of histori-cizing material form and of calling attention to the tensions between and continuities of the past and the present. The vernacular sacred histories that he provides in the *Abbreuiacion, Life of Saint Katherine*, and *Solace of Pilgrims* thus provide a means of reminding his readers that while mater-ial memorials sometimes obscure their origins, reading and writing can make the histories and affiliations of those objects known. While sacred history is always in danger of replicating the illusion of the idol by for-getting that it too is a form, a sign marking alterity, absence, and prom-ising a solace that can only ever be partial, Capgrave finds in vernacular, sacred history a mode of embodying the past for a late medieval audience that daily encounters material memorials but is also increasingly able to respond to Katherine's charge: "Rede in your boke, loke in her lynage."

Reginald Pecock's libri laicorum

> The history of culture is in part the story of a protracted struggle for
> dominance between pictorial and linguistic signs.
>
> W. J. T. Mitchell[1]

As we saw in the last chapter, for John Capgrave, images are both power-
ful and dangerous insofar as they incarnate cultural memory. Yet for
Capgrave's contemporary, Reginald Pecock (*c.* 1392–1460), it is precisely
the corporate efficacy, physicality, and accessibility of images that validate
their continued use and distinguish them from books. In his long defense
of contemporary ecclesiastical structures and practices, *The Repressor of
Over Much Blaming of the Clergy* (*c.* 1449), Pecock insists that the stor-
ies of saints are remembered more easily "by siȝt, than by the heering
of othere mennys reding or bi heering of his owne reding."[2] Just as sight
impresses images upon the viewer's mind more immediately than reading
a book, ritual and physical engagement embodies a lesson and facilitates
the process of memory-making. Such is the case with the life of Saint
Katherine:

Whanne the dai of Seint Kateryn schal be come, marke who so wole in his mynde
alle the bokis whiche ben in Londoun writun upon Seint Kateryn's lijf and pas-
siouns, and y dare weel seie that thouȝ ther were x. thousind mo bokis writun in
Londoun in thilk day of the same Seintis lijf and passioun, thei schulden not so
moche turne the citee into mynde of the holi famose lijf of Seint Kateryn and
of her dignitee in which sche now is, as dooth in ech ȝeer the going of peple
in pilgrimage to the College of Seint Kateryn bisidis London … Wherfore riȝt
greet special commoditees and profitis into remembraunce making ymagis and
pilgrimagis han and doon, whiche writingis not so han and doon.[3]

This example works, in part, on a hyperbolic comparison of visual and
literary experience. Even if there were ten thousand more books writ-
ten about Saint Katherine, Pecock claims, these books would not be able
to "turne the citee into mynde" of the saint as immediately as does the

sight of pilgrims on her feast day.⁴ Moreover, this passage moves from the individual consciousness of Pecock's reader (as he commands his reader: "marke who so wole in his mynde") to the corporate consciousness of the city, thus aligning books with private reading and images (broadly conceived) with communal experience. In short, Pecock argues that written materials simply cannot transmit cultural memory as effectively as can these physical artifacts, processions, and pilgrimages.

But Pecock's emphasis here on the mnemonic and affective power of visual experience is neither a denigration of the value of vernacular religious books nor even an assertion that images are preferable *libri laicorum*. In fact, he was remarkably committed to making vernacular theological texts available to a broader audience, both by writing his own English treatises and supporting the creation of lending libraries and production of common-profit books.⁵ In these ventures, he made a distinctive contribution to contemporary religious debates about the best means of educating the laity in moral and theological matters. As many recent readers of Pecock have noted, his advocacy of the production and circulation of vernacular theological writing is radically reformist – he acknowledges the laity's need and desire for religious instruction in English and meets that need with an extensive body of writings with the explicit aim of lay instruction.⁶ At the same time, his defense of "seable signes" is a fundamentally conservative effort to protect the social and religious structures that he views as threatened by heterodox rejection of images and privileging of texts.⁷ This chapter will examine how Pecock negotiates these oppositions and relations between texts and images, reason and experience, and private devotion and public ritual.

In the words of this chapter's epigraph, Pecock's writings throw into relief the "protracted struggle for dominance between pictorial and linguistic signs" throughout the fifteenth century. On the one hand, Lollard writers often argued that the vernacular scriptures are sufficient means for education in Christian life and doctrine and less susceptible to abuse than images. The fifteenth-century church, on the other hand, maintained that images are more suitable pedagogical media for the laity than religious writings.⁸ Pecock seeks a *via media*. He does not entirely disagree with Lollard assertions that texts are preferable pedagogical tools, but he offers a more nuanced consideration of the relationships between and relative values of devotional images and vernacular texts.⁹ He suggests that, while both "seable signes" and "heereable signes" are necessary for the spiritual lives of the laity, they have different functions. And although he concedes that books surpass images "in cleernes of teching," Pecock argues that

the materiality of images gives them a unique advantage in prompting memory, stirring spiritual thoughts, and contributing to social cohesion.[10] Ultimately, his corpus reminds us that the late medieval conflict over the status of the vernacular text was simultaneously a conflict over the status of the image. The two forms cannot be separated; they are inextricably linked by their common use as *libri laicorum*.

Pecock provides the most comprehensive and explicit theorization of this relationship in fifteenth-century English writing. Even though his extended apologetics for contemporary visual piety take the form of carefully reasoned, polemical prose, they display the same ambivalences that characterize the literary considerations of images by Hoccleve, Lydgate, and Capgrave. Yet Pecock's style and methods of persuasion diverge from these contemporaries in some important ways. In lieu of aureate vocabulary, autobiographical *exempla*, and figural and historical contextualization, Pecock writes in dense prose that often reads like that of contemporary heretical writings.[11] But like his literary contemporaries, Pecock understands and exploits the increasing importance of vernacular discourse and textual production; his vernacularization of Latinate discourses and hermeneutic modes re-forms prevalent textual models of lay instruction. While this final chapter turns from poetry to prose and from literary forms to academic syllogisms, in it I will show that concerns about the reformation of image use continue to be bound up with the reformation of vernacular religious writing into the second half of the fifteenth century.

Despite recent attention to Pecock's educational program and commitment to vernacular textual production, scholars have generally not considered in any detail the relationship between visual and textual *libri laicorum* in Pecock's corpus.[12] But "heereable signes" and "seable signes" are the paired media of lay education for Pecock. Drawing primarily on his extended discussion of images in the second part of the *Repressor*, this chapter seeks to address this (sometimes fraught) sisterhood. As is the case with many of his contemporaries, Pecock's discussion of images and texts addresses both the signs themselves and their reception. To this end, this chapter is divided into two parts. The first considers Pecock's representation of these signs – their divergent arenas, functions, and values. I begin with Pecock's representation of "heereable signes" and "seable signes" and suggest that if Pecock represents vernacular books as belonging to the domain of the emergent, as the radical media of rational inquiry, then he characterizes "seable signes" as belonging to the domain of the residual and conservative; they are fundamentally social and affective media. The second half of the chapter examines Pecock's answer to the hermeneutic

question posed throughout this book (how are these *libri laicorum* to be read?). Even while Pecock insists on the divergent functions of images and texts, he maintains that both visual and verbal books should be interpreted in the same way and offers an extended reading lesson to this end. That section thus examines Pecock's attempts to teach his lay audience how to read both images and texts; it examines his turn, in other words, to literary or aesthetic theory. The chapter concludes with a very brief reflection on the effects of contemporary ecclesiastical fears about schism on changing attitudes toward visual and textual *libri laicorum* in the mid fifteenth century. Pecock's writing on images reveals the growing tensions between the church's theological conservatism, increasing lay literacy and autonomy, and the production of political and social stability in late medieval England. In sum, much like the ambivalence about the visual image evident in the works of his contemporaries, Pecock's analysis of the function and efficacy of images reflects the extent to which mid fifteenth-century religious discourse continued to be marked by a deep, unsettled questioning about the function of the visual and the textual.

"heereable signes"

In 1459, Pecock was consigned for the remainder of his life to a private chamber in Thorney Abbey under strict orders issued by the archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Bourchier, that he not be given any written materials other than service books, a legendary and a Bible and that he should "haue nothing to write with, ne stuff to write vpon."[13] During the previous year, Bourchier, supported by a mandate from Pope Pius II, had zealously sought out those who possessed Pecock's writings, notifying clerics to warn their flocks that any person possessing a book by Pecock would be suspected of heresy.[14] Encouraging the circulation of English theological treatises in the mid fifteenth century and elevating the role of human reason over church tradition, Pecock may have seemed to his clerical peers to have more in common with the heretics he was arguing against than with the ecclesiastical establishment he claimed to be supporting.[15] The transfer to the rural isolation of the Cambridgeshire abbey and the deprivation and destruction of the written word were perhaps fitting punishments for Pecock, whose life and work were rooted in the urban institutions and piety of London and distinguished by the production and distribution of theological books.

   Pecock's theological corpus was originally composed of both Latin and English texts and comprised more than fifty separate books. Presumably

because of numerous ecclesiastical commands to search out and destroy his writings, only six of these remain, all in unique manuscripts and all in English: *The Reule of Crysten Religioun* (1443), *The Donet* (*c.* 1443–49), *The Folewer to the Donet* (1453–54), *The Poore Mennis Myrrour* (*c.* 1443–49), *The Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy* (*c.* 1449), and *The Book of Faith* (1456).[16] Records suggest that dozens of other books by Pecock were burned at St. Paul's Cross in December of 1457 after his public recantation.[17] Though a number of these lost books were likely Latin texts, Pecock evidently sought to write a comprehensive theological curriculum for lay readers. To this end, he structured several of his works as dialogues between a student and teacher (*The Donet* and *The Folewer to the Donet*) and between a father and a son (*The Book of Faith*). Others, such as the *Repressor* and *The Reule of Crysten Religioun*, are compendious, carefully argued theological treatises. But if they address a variety of subjects and utilize different genres, Pecock's overall aim remains consistent across these texts: he seeks to refute heresy with rational argument and to educate his readers in the methods of rational inquiry. More problematically, he does so in what he calls the "lay tonge," the medium of heresy, and often ventriloquizes heretical ideas before beginning his refutation of them.[18] And in Pecock's fifteenth century, as many modern critics have reminded us, writing theology in English was *prima facie* a political act.[19] Pecock is well aware that his approach to educating the laity and defending the faith is unorthodox: the prologues of several of the extant texts indicate his concern about the ecclesiastical censorship of vernacular religious writing, offer justifications of his decision to write in English, and defend him against possible charges of heresy. But in the end it was less Pecock's use of the vernacular than the ideas he articulated in it that landed him in hot water.[20]

Foremost among these unorthodox ideas is Pecock's insistence that the layperson is fully capable of learning "bi hem silf" when provided with appropriate books and taught the methods of rational inquiry. As his trial records and the writings of his many adversaries imply, Pecock was frequently criticized for privileging the "doom of resoun" over church authority, tradition, and scripture.[21] Unlike Hoccleve, who argues that faith proved by reason is no faith at all, and unlike other contemporary theologians, who suggested that only clerics and scholars should ponder theologically difficult subjects, Pecock asserts that the laity as well as the clergy should submit the articles of faith to rigorous critical inquiry.[22] This representation of the "doom of resoun" as universally available distances him from clerical writers such as Nicholas Love, who maintained

that the lay reader's intellectual capacity was limited to the physical or affective realms.[23] Given his commitment to the authority of reason, it is not surprising that Pecock maintains that instruction in the methods of rational inquiry should not to be restricted to the Latinate pedagogy of the schools. To make these rational methods accessible to the laity, however, demands both new vernacular forms – "vernacular theology" (in the most literal sense of the phrase) – and a willingness to challenge current ecclesiastical paradigms of what a layperson should and should not be taught. Pecock thus repeatedly argues for making theological texts based on a syllogistic logic available in the "lay tonge."

One of the central ways that late medieval laypeople were educated in religious matters was, of course, preaching. Indeed, the education of the laity by means of vernacular preaching was an important effect of Chichele's archbishopric and contemporary conciliar reform.[24] But while many of Pecock's contemporaries advocated preaching as the best mode of religious education, Pecock argues to the contrary that preaching

schal neuer take his parfite effect, neiþer in ȝeuyng to þe peple sufficient and stable doctryne neiþer in prentyng into hem abiding deuocioun, wiþoute þat þe peple haue at hem silf in writing which þei mowe ofte rede or heere oft rad þe substancial poyntis and trouþis whiche ben to hem to be prechid bi mouþe.[25]

In other words, Pecock does not see preaching as able to provide either the "sufficient" or "stable doctryne" of a written text. While a person might misremember or misunderstand a sermon, written texts potentially stabilize and standardize the message. If writing is misinterpreted, the reader can be directed back to the text for confirmation or correction. And, as Wendy Scase has noted, Pecock emphasizes that "books could preach and teach perpetually."[26] More specifically, Pecock shamelessly advertises his *own* books as ideal *libri laicorum*, suggesting, for example, that the *Reule* itself provides necessary religious education "which can not so esili be leerned in oþer bokes, neiþer in sermouns or prechingis, neiþer bi mennys spekingis."[27] Although both books and sermons are "heereable signes," Pecock's privileging of the written text is rooted in his conviction that it is the more stable and permanent medium of the two.

Vernacular religious texts also are more useful for lay readers, in Pecock's view, than the Bible, especially insofar as they provide a means of defense against heretical teaching. Pecock recognizes the pleasure that reading the Bible in English brings to the laity, describing it as being "miche delectable and sweete, [because it] drawith the reders into a deuocioun and a loue to God," but he does not see it as a sufficient means of

religious education. In order to facilitate the "sure leernyng and knowing of Goddis lawe and seruice" the reader needs interpretive guides.[28] The first part of the *Repressor* is dedicated to providing this instruction and proving that "myche moral philsophie and miche lawe of kinde is algatis necessarie to be leerned, as weel as the Bible," for without this supplementary learning, "the Bible may not be ariȝt vndirstonde."[29] For Pecock, unlike the Lollards, the Bible is a subtle, obscure text.[30] It is difficult to understand without scholarly background and historical contextualization.[31] For those who are guided by the "lawe of kinde," written materials, including the scriptures and philosophical and theological treatises, can be extraordinarily helpful interpretive aids.

Moreover, it is important for Pecock that these aids be made available in the vernacular, even though many of his clerical colleagues argued that English was not an appropriate language for religious or philosophical discourse and that lay readers would not have the intellectual capacities to engage in any meaningful way with such material. In the opening pages of his *Folewer*, Pecock explains his reasons for writing in English and argues that vernacular theological treatises need not be too difficult for the literate layperson, insisting that his books "passen not ech lay mannys power which haþ assaied hem eer þis day to hem leerne and vndirstonde."[32] Always prepared for the inevitable objections that his vernacular theological writings will prompt, Pecock again asserts his confidence in the rational capacities of the laity. He acknowledges that some readers may not understand everything in the book on its first reading but suggests that they will still find some benefit from reading it and may be assisted by those who have read it before. Just because a book may be difficult upon its first reading does not mean that books should not be read. To emphasize this point, Pecock equates the lay reading of vernacular religious texts with the clerical reading of the Latin Bible: "Þe bible in latyn in many of his parties passiþ þe capacite and þe power of ful many grete clerkis and of grete and kunnyng doctouris. Schulen þei þerfore caste aside þe bible, and not rede and studie in eny oþir parti þerof? God forbede ȝhe."[33] On the one hand, Pecock here assures his lay audience that reading always requires work and implies that careful study has its own rewards. On the other hand, this passage divulges that many clerics often do not understand what they read. This admission of clerical inadequacy is striking, especially insofar as it suggests Pecock's disregard for preserving clear boundaries between the learned clergy and the "vnlettrid" laity.[34]

Nevertheless, many of Pecock's writings subtly reinscribe lay education within these institutionalized boundaries, even as the vernacular

forms in which they are expressed seem to erase them.[35] For example, Pecock privileges the dialogic form throughout his corpus, arguing that his books should be received with "fauour" precisely because of the way in which they replicate the friendly "togider talking" of the learned and unlearned. In *The Book of Faith*, he describes this generic choice as follows: "siþen y haue chose forto make summe of my bokis in foorme of a dialog bi togider talking bitwixe þe sone and þe fadir. Y wole loke aftir þat þo bokis haue þe fauour which such dialogazacioun or togider talking and clatering ouȝte haue and may haue."[36] Yet the subsequent questioning of the father by the son in *The Book of Faith* is not exactly the "dialogazacioun or togider talking" that Pecock claims it will be. To the contrary, the dialogic format of the *Book* subtly reasserts the ecclesiastical hierarchy that Pecock must maintain to remain on the right side of the fine line of orthodoxy.[37] Depicting the instruction as between a father and son, Pecock quite intentionally seeks the regulation inherent in a mediated conversation between a person and his or her superior. The dialogue, as employed by Pecock, is not a "togider talking" but a pedagogical opportunity, positing a learned leader and an unlearned follower in need of instruction.

Even so, Pecock's emphasis on "dialogazacioun" also suggests his rather unorthodox views of clerical responsibility for lay learning. In the *Folewer*, Pecock conjectures that circulating difficult vernacular books among the laity may yield "grettir frendschip, loue, and good acqueyntaunce and felawlik comunycacioun and good spendyng of tyme … bitwix clerkis and lay men."[38] While this sense of intellectual camaraderie brought about by vernacular texts may seem rather idyllic, it also betrays Pecock's underlying agenda regarding the role of the clergy in the instruction of the laity. In the end, Pecock's acknowledgement of the rationality of the laity, his suggestion of the usefulness of providing them with books, and his advice that they learn through "felawlik comunycacioun" rather than sermons, all encourage increased lay autonomy and decreased clerical responsibility for the spiritual well-being of their flocks.

In the *Repressor*, he reiterates and complicates this point, drawing on maternal metaphors to offer one final explanation of both the cleric's responsibility and its limits:

For euen as a nurisch or a modir is not bounde forto alwey and for euere fede her children and putte meete in her mouthis, but sche muste teche hem that thei fede hem silf (and in lijk maner doon foulis to her briddis,) so a curat mai not neither ouȝte forto alwey rynge at the eeris of hise suggettis; but he may so bigynne, and afterward he ouȝte teche hem that thei leerne *bi hem silf* and practize

meenis into leernyng of good lyuyng *bi hem silf*; and ellis he schal make hem to be euere truauntis in the scole of God.[39] (my emphases)

Although his choice of metaphor suggests the conventional institutional hierarchy here – the mother bird must feed her children – Pecock is not simply reinforcing what Rita Copeland has called the "institutionalized split between pedagogy and hermeneutics."[40] Rather, he appropriates a clerical commonplace not to maintain distinctions between the learned and the lewd but to offer a model for their (albeit partial) erasure. He claims that the ultimate goal of clerics should be to help the unlearned become autonomous readers and interpreters. And when clerics teach their subjects to feed themselves, he implies in the final line, even lay readers might become scholars, rather than "truauntis in the scole of God."

If the clergy are to encourage lay autonomy and enable laypeople to learn "bi hem silf," they will need to produce and circulate theological materials in the "lay tonge." In other words, they will need to rethink the roles and types of *libri laicorum* in lay education, relying less on sermons and more on the circulation of English books. Lay learning, in Pecock's vision, will come about "bi reding in her bokis at her owne housis, or bi heering suche bookis red of her neiȝboris … and also bi vce of preisyngis and of preiers, and bi vce of worschiping doon bi seable rememoratijf signes."[41] Pecock's ordering of these tools of spiritual pedagogy, beginning with reading and hearing texts and concluding with "seable" signs or images, suggests his awareness of changing lay devotional tastes and practices and the importance of adapting to these cultural shifts. Unlike many of his clerical contemporaries, he encourages lay possession of books and circulation of texts among friends or "neiȝboris." The disciple in the *Reule* reinforces the primacy of the written word:

al þin holy wordis, lord, reding, heering or remembring, ben more speedful into þis purpos of gendring welwilling and loue toward þe, god, and þi service, and þerfore of gendring alle maner good deedis of þi servicis, þan ben þe oþere signes in her beste maner vsing.[42]

Among all possible "signes" this passage suggests, written language is best. Even when "oþere signes" are used to their highest capacity, they simply cannot effect the same "gendring" of love and service to God. Thus, for Pecock, vernacular theological books are important *libri laicorum* insofar as they enable the laity to learn "bi hem silf" even as the books circumscribe that learning within the institutional hierarchy. In short, Pecock wishes to reclaim vernacular theology for orthodox religious education.

Given his interest in the composition and circulation of vernacular theological texts, a prolonged defense of images and pilgrimages may seem to "sit uneasily within Pecock's *oeuvre*," as Hardwick has argued.[43] Yet the use of images and pilgrimages is a persistent concern of Pecock's corpus. Image use is the lengthiest "governance" addressed in the *Represser*; it is discussed throughout Pecock's other extant works; and was apparently the sole subject of one of his lost texts, *The Book of Worshipping*. I would like to suggest that Pecock's interest in the continued use of images as *libri laicorum* reflects the fundamental conservatism which underlies his sometimes innovative textual and pedagogical choices. He is less interested in "sensible signes" *per se* than in what they contribute to the maintenance of social, political, and ecclesiastical institutions. For Pecock, images are essentially corporate; they maintain social practices and hierarchies and contribute to social cohesion. Thus, in this section I will first consider the ways Pecock portrays images as both producers of and products of ritual and cultural memory. Second, I will examine how such a representation of images distinguishes them from texts by highlighting their role as corporate artifacts, particularly suited for the preservation of the appearance of social cohesion in a society that Pecock sees as besieged by the threat of schism.

Pecock almost always discusses images in relation to texts. Although he appropriates the standard defense of images as *libri laicorum*, his improvisation on this theme is distinctive. Unlike other contemporary defenders of images, who cite the traditional explanation that images are useful for teaching, for remembering, and for arousing feelings of devotion, Pecock's justification of images avoids any direct articulation of this three-pronged apologetic. He also does not draw the common distinction between *dulia* and *latria*. Instead, he plays on the implicit textuality of the visual in the formulation *libri laicorum* to explore the changing roles of images and texts in his culture and maps out an alternative schema for thinking about visual and textual experience.

Central to this schema is Pecock's consideration of the relationship of memory to sensory experience. Images, because they are physical, imprint on the memory in a different manner than texts.[44] While he argues that both images and texts have mnemonic value, he emphasizes the role of images as "rememoratijf signes" and de-emphasizes their pedagogical functions, reserving that role for vernacular texts, which he believes are the best means of conveying abstract theological concepts. As

"rememoratijf or mynding signes," images function like red strings tied around one's finger:

If a marchant or eny other man haue myche nede forto bithenke upon a certeine erand, it is weel allowid and approued in resoun that he take and vse sum seable rememoratijf signe and tokene forto mynde and remembre him upon the same erand; and it is weel allowid and approued bi resoun that he make a ring of a rische and putte it on his fynger.[45]

The mere physical presence of images reminds their viewer of something he or she already knows. Images do not teach anything new. Nor do they engage their viewer in complex thought. As Pecock's mercantile example implies, images are needed primarily because they are functional and useful. They are a reasonable solution for human forgetfulness. Throughout his defense of images, Pecock relies on everyday examples such as this one. In so doing, he locates images within the realm of the mundane and practical.

   Although he insists that image use is justified by reason, Pecock frequently appeals to the "doom of experience" in his examples. In justifying images by means of experience, Pecock highlights that the human encounter with images is always embodied and thus sometimes cannot be fully explained by reason alone. The defense of images, in other words, is best made in reference to their everyday use. For this reason, Pecock's apologetic for images responds to the points raised in Lollard writings with a series of specific examples and short narratives. Whereas many Lollard writers insist that books bring to mind the "benefetis of God, his punyschingis, his holi lijf and passioun" more effectively than images, Pecock counters with examples of the value of image use based on quotidian experience and common knowledge that show that images are able to convey information more rapidly and with less mental labor than texts and that they are more accessible than texts since they are displayed in public places.[46]

   Pecock begins his argument against the Lollard call for the replacement of images and pilgrimages with "writingis" by arguing that texts are not sufficient replacements because humans are embodied and benefit from physical mnemonic aids (like the red string around the finger). Physical signs are a concession to human frailty:

Mankinde in this lijf is so freel, that forto make into him sufficient remembraunce of thingis to be profitabli of him remembrid he nedith not oonli heereable rememoratijf signes, (as ben Holi Scripture and othere deuoute writingis,) but he nedith also therwith and ther to seable rememoratijf signes; as experience wole weel

schewe, that thouȝ mankinde take al the avauntage whiche he may forto plucke him vpward and forto holde him upward in good thouȝtis, (bi seable signes of ymagis and picturis as eke bi heereable signes of writingis,) al is litil ynouȝ.[47]

Here as throughout his writings on this topic, Pecock accepts the kinship of "heereable" and "seable signes" – although they signify differently, both images and writing are ultimately *signs*. While Lollards claim that books and sermons are sufficient reminders of the fundamentals of the faith, Pecock argues that *experience* proves that "heereable signes" are not adequate for the education of the laity. Since humans are embodied, they find "bodily" or "seable signes" to be more immediately accessible. Moreover, Pecock asks, if "heereable signes of writingis" are sufficient, then why did Christ institute the sacraments?[48] In his assertion that the laity are frail and benefit from physical reminders, Pecock appears to be aligning himself with Nicholas Love's pejorative assessment of the laity as frail, simple souls who "kan not þenke bot bodyes or bodily þinges," but Pecock's position is decidedly more moderate, especially insofar as it acknowledges the complementarities of "heereable" and "seable" signs.[49] Both images and books are necessary, Pecock insists, for "sufficient remembraunce of thingis."

To be sure, images have several distinct advantages in appealing to the laity. The first of these "riȝt synguler avauntagis" is the image's ability to remind quickly and without the labor and study that Pecock associates with books. To illustrate this point, he first describes a man who wishes to remember the passion of one of the saints. Pecock notes that even though the man could read the story in a book, he would have to read at least six or seven leaves before he would be able to remember the same story conveyed "bi siȝt of the iȝe in biholding an ymage … or in biholding a storie openli ther of purtreied or peintid in the wal or in a clooth."[50] Sight offers immediate cognition and memory, Pecock observes, whereas reading requires time and effort. Moreover, he explains the ease of this visual learning by vague allusion to contemporary optical theory:

the iȝe siȝt schewith and bringith into the ymaginacioun and into the mynde withynne in the heed of a man myche mater and long mater sooner, and with lasse labour and traueil and peine, than the heering of the eere dooth. And if this now seid is trewe of a man which can rede in bokis stories writun, that myche sooner and in schortir tyme and with lasse labour and pein in his brayn he schal come into remembraunce of a long storie bi siȝt, than bi the heering of othere mennys reding or bi heering of his owne reding; miche rather this is trewe of alle tho persoones whiche kunnen not rede in bokis.[51]

In other words, it is simply easier to remember what one sees than what one hears or reads. In this formulation, Pecock echoes the ocular

epistemologies that had become prevalent in mendicant homiletic literatures and other forms of vernacular literary and religious discourse.[52] Sight, he clearly articulates, is the privileged sense in the acquisition of knowledge, or at least in the prompting of remembrance. It enables learning much more quickly and with less "labour and pein in [the] brayn" than does reading. If images and books are both "mynding" signs, they diverge in how efficiently they can impress the memory on the mind.

Additional examples follow that emphasize both human frailty and the painlessness of learning from images. In another, Pecock suggests that when a fatigued or ill person whose "heed is feeble for labour or studie" comes to church, the wall paintings, windows, and statuary will move their viewer more deeply than written materials: "bi biholding upon ymagis or upon such peinting his witt schal be dressid and lad forthe euener and more stabili and with myche lasse peyne and labour, than forto wrastle withinneforth in his owne ymaginaciouns withoute leding withouteforth had bi biholding upon ymagis; as experience vndoutabili wole schewe."[53] Here again, to speak of the "experience" of the image is to move away from the realm of pure reason and into that of affect and embodiment.[54] Like Hoccleve's claim that images function like "spectacles" that help "feeble sighte," Pecock emphasizes how images direct and stabilize the viewer's "ymaginaciouns," which may be too feeble to bring to mind what is heard in a sermon or read in a book.[55] The late fourteenth-century preacher, John Mirk, suggested similarly in his *Festial* that "þer ben mony þousaund of pepul þat couþ not ymagen in her hert how Crist was don on þe rood, but as þai lerne hit be syȝt of ymages and payntours."[56] Visual experience, Pecock concurs, is less laborious than reading and facilitates quicker internalization of knowledge than auditory experience.

The second part of Pecock's defense of the unique qualities of images is based on their accessibility. As we have noted, late medieval England was characterized by a flourishing visual culture.[57] From statues and stained glass to books of hours and wall paintings, the devout layperson would not have had to travel far to find "seable signes."[58] And, for Pecock, this is a distinct advantage of images. He comments that even if a reader were to attempt to acquire the same knowledge through books, he or she would not find the number and breadth of stories as readily available and easily accessible as those painted on church walls. For this reason, "seable signes" are more useful for the devotional reflection of the laity than are books. To this end, he writes:

Also here with al into the open siȝt of ymagis in open chirchis alle peple (men and wommen and children) mowe come whanne euere thei wolen in ech tyme

of the day, but so mowe thei not come in to the vce of bokis to be delyuered to hem neither to be red bifore hem; and therfore as forto soone and ofte come into remembraunce of a long mater bi ech oon persoone, and also as forto make that the mo persoones come into remembraunce of a mater, ymagis and picturis seruen in a specialer maner than bokis doon.[59]

Here, Pecock appropriates and inverts a frequent claim in Lollard writings that the biblical text should be "open," pointing out, instead, that images are always more "open" than books.[60] He thus draws a stark contrast between the universal accessibility of images and the limited availability of books. The corporate aspect of viewing images simply cannot be matched by reading individual books, which are not available on demand to the average layperson.

Thus, although Pecock concedes that books "seruen bettir into remembrauncing of tho same materis than ymagis and picturis doon," images "seruen in a specialer maner than bokis doon."[61] To demonstrate what he means by "specialer maner," he relies again on the rhetoric and "doom of experience," first describing the effect of the multiplicity of images of saints painted on church walls:

In beholding bi siȝt of iȝe upon manye dyuerse stories or ymagis in the chirche a man schal in a litil while be remembrid now upon the passioun of Seint Laurence, and now anoon aftir upon the passioun of Seint Steuen, now anoon aftir upon the passioun of Petir, and so forth of manye chaungis. And if in thilk while in the chirche were not ymagis and picturis, he schulde not bi reding in a book in xx sithis lenger tyme come into so miche remembraunce and namelich of so manye dyuerse passiouns to be rad; namelich sithen the reder schal not fynde writingis of alle tho passiouns saue in dyuerse bokis, or at the leste in dyuerse placis of oon book.[62]

Pecock follows this example with that of the annual pilgrimage to St. Katherine's college in London, re-emphasizing that the procession is more mnemonically effective than are "alle the bokis whiche ben in Londoun writun upon Seint Kateryn's lijf and passiouns."[63] Both of these narrative excursions depend on hyperbolic comparison of images and texts. Even if a reader had a book of saints' lives, it would take her twenty times longer to read the accounts of Laurence and Peter than to walk around a church and see the stories of their lives and passions. Even if there were ten thousand more books written about Saint Katherine, they would not be able to remind the entire city of the saint as well as can the sight of a mass of pilgrims. In these examples, Pecock emphasizes the power of images to create a cohesive political and urban community. Processions, as Eamon Duffy suggests, served as "celebrations of communal identity."[64] Devotional images

and pilgrimages, like the mass and the drama, are social texts, Pecock suggests, enabling cultural and communal memory in a way impossible for both the written text and the word preached from the pulpit.[65]

Moreover, echoing Hoccleve's concern about "unsighte," Pecock claims that the absence of images is potentially harmful to Christians:

withoute rememoratijf signes of a thing or of thingis the rememoracion or the remembraunce of thilk thing or thingis muste needis be the febler, as experience sufficientli witnessith; and therfore, sithen the bodi or the bonis or othere relikis of eny persoon is a ful nyȝ rememoratijf signe of the same persoon, it is ful resonable and ful worthi that where the bodi or bonis or eny releef or relik of a Seint mai be had, that it be sett up in a comoun place to which peple may haue her deuout neiȝing and accesse, forto haue her deuout biholding ther upon forto make the seid therbi remembraunce.[66]

Because humans are embodied, he argues again, their memory is strengthened by sensory experience, by physical encounters with physical things such as other bodies, bones, relics, and images. Experience shows that without sensible signs humans simply do not remember well. The remedy for this lack of remembrance, Pecock adds, is to display bodily signs in a "comoun place" where they are accessible to the laity. Here as throughout his writings on images, Pecock explains images primarily as objects of corporate devotion and remembrance. He never addresses private devotional practices using images, such as might be found in prayer books, triptychs and diptychs, or other personal devotional artifacts. Although Pecock views images and texts as complementary (if not equivalent) means of lay education, he ultimately privileges the pedagogical value of the textual over that of the visual. Yet he insists that images may provoke an affective, bodily, or communal response more effectively than can texts.

To highlight this point further, Pecock includes yet another example, recounting the biannual commemoration of Bishop Stephen Gravesend at his sepulcher in St. Paul's Cathedral. During these commemorations, Pecock explains, the mayor of London, aldermen, and many more people assemble by the sepulcher, stand in two long rows, and say a *De profundis* for the bishop's soul. Written commemoration and written prayers, Pecock claims, simply would not have the same social effect:

ȝit treuthe is, that if the seid bischop wolde haue ordeyned xx. thousand bokis to be writun of his seid benefeting, and wolde haue ordeyned hem be spred abrode in dyuerse placis of the cite, and forto haue be cheyned in tho dyuerse placis of the cite, that of the peple who so wolde myȝte rede ther in the seid benefeting, thilk multitude of bokis schulden not haue contynued so myche and so weel into this day the mynde of thilk bischopis benefeting.[67]

As in the first example, Pecock uses hyperbole to emphasize the divergent results of reading and seeing. He again depicts reading as an individual practice (one gets the sense of twenty thousand individual readers scattered across London). He also suggests the inaccessibility of books (and even gestures toward the ecclesiastical regulation of lay reading), noting that they are "cheyned" in diverse places throughout the city. Seeing, on the other hand, is participatory and social.

This defense is not limited to his extended apologetic for images in the *Repressor*. In the *Reule*, Pecock similarly bases his argument for the continued use of images on bodily and corporate experience, explaining that many of the "sensible signes" displayed in churches represent lay initiatives:

> of whiche signes summe ben ordeyned of þi clergie wiþ consent of þe comoun peple, as ben þe bodili hous of þe chirche wiþ alle þe ornamentis þerynne, wiþ liȝtis, encensis, hali watir, gay and riche cloþis and garnementis, crossis, ymagis, peyntingis, bellis, organs, myrie songis, stipelis, gay corven roofis wiþ craftiose windowis, dyuersite of deedis to be doon after reule and ordre of þe ordinal, and manye oþere þingis and deedis; summe ben lefte to þe comoun peplis owne devising.[68]

To support his argument that visual "signes and tokenes" serve as reminders, he lists the concrete decorations and aesthetic ornamentations of a church, drawing his reader into a sacred space rooted in sensory experience. The worshippers would see the flickering candles, smell the incense, be sprinkled with the holy water, hear the songs and bells, and be dwarfed by the carved roof, steeple, and stained-glass windows. Yet the laity's participation in the sacred space that prompts affective experience and memory of the sacred narrative is not Pecock's only concern. He also notes that the people have personal and material interest in images. The adorned church is a social space as well as a sacred space, constituted in part by "þe comoun peplis owne devising" and thus resonant with cultural and economic transactions.[69] Whereas Lollard writers used lists such as this to call attention to the excesses of ecclesiastical adornment, Pecock uses the list to emphasize the multiplicity of ways the laity participate in creating their own sacred space. And where Lollard texts call into question the lay investment in the fabric of the church, Pecock's corpus revalues this investment, representing the communal and political affiliations embodied in devotional objects in a positive light.[70] Pecock thus implies that lay contribution to and participation in this visual economy strengthens the foundation of both the "bodili hous" of the church and the social and ecclesiastical structures it represents. Thus the installation

of images in churches contributes to the preservation of the social and theological status quo.[71]

Similarly, Pecock's defense of pilgrimages to sites of holy images is principally concerned with the beneficial social effects of ritual practice. Lollards often paired images and pilgrimages in their critiques of corrupt ecclesiastical practices.[72] Concerned that people go on pilgrimage with wrong motives, they frequently argued that pilgrimages should be spiritual rather than physical. In his argument that true pilgrimage is internal, the Lollard author of *The Lanterne of Liȝt* outlines six types of metaphorical pilgrimage, representing "trewe" pilgrimage as the journey through the Christian life, beginning with birth and ending with the divine judgment after death.[73] Conspicuously absent from these varieties of pilgrimage is the practice of traveling to shrines or holy places. Pecock, on the other hand, explicitly defines his position against the Lollard argument, emphasizing the role of pilgrimage as a "bodili going or a bodili remouyng fro oon place into an other."[74] As his multiplication of examples implies, this focus on particular places and on embodied experience is central to Pecock's distinction between "seable signes" and "heereable signes."

Although Lollards sometimes concede that a pilgrimage could be done privately, if it is for one's "owne edificacioun oonli," as Pecock sees it the primary function of a pilgrimage is social and exemplary.[75] The sight of pilgrims inspires others to go on pilgrimage. To this end, he insists that pilgrimages should be done publicly and argues that "a man mai vertuoseli, honestli, and expedientli go in pilgrimage in such maner that therbi he ensaumple his dede of pilgrimage to be folewid of othere men … who euer wole go in pilgrimage vnder this … entent, he muste do it openli and not priueli; and ellis he failith in his pilgrimage."[76] Pecock's assertion that pilgrimages must be done publicly, or "openli," because of their exemplary social function resonates with his interest in the social functions images play precisely because they are displayed "in open siȝt … in open chirchis."[77] The "openness" of both images and pilgrimages is directly opposed to the perceived hiddenness and privatization of Lollard religious practices. Those on pilgrimage publicly demonstrate (or "ensaumple") orthodox devotional practices to their viewers.

Pilgrimages, like images, contribute to social cohesion because they simultaneously offer the appearance of the unity of the social body and maintain social distinctions and hierarchies. Since pilgrimages should be done openly to serve as examples to onlookers, Pecock advocates that the pilgrims should carry visible tokens indicating that they are making a pilgrimage. He does not shy away from the fact that these "tokens" do

not simply announce the pious journey of their bearers but also differentiate between them, indicating social or ecclesiastical status. Just as Chaucer found it useful to begin his collection of tales with recounting the "degree" of each of his pilgrims, Pecock suggests that open display of social rank will enhance the exemplary function of the pilgrimage.[78] He writes that these pilgrimage tokens (which he describes as images) should be left at the pilgrimage site to

moue the seers for to enquere who offrid thilk ymage; and if it be answerid, that a bischop or an other notable man it offrid there and it brouȝt thidir bi pilgrimage, the seer and heerer hereof schal thinke that the offrer therof hadde sum notable cause forto so bringe thilk ymage thidir and so offre it, and therbi be the more stirid into deuocioun toward God or the Seint in thilk place.[79]

The laity will be more effectively "stirid into deuocioun" when led by the example of some "notable man," Pecock claims. It is for this reason, he continues, that the powerful or wealthy should leave their tokens at the pilgrimage site, hung high so that all other pilgrims may see.

Similarly, Pecock encourages priests and bishops to go on pilgrimages and display their tokens to set an example for "louȝer men."[80] Though Pecock calls his social peers to participation in social rituals such as pilgrimages, this call is more to "ensaumple vertuose and deuoute deedis" than to benefit personally from the spiritual practices. Indeed, we might concur with E. M. Blackie's suggestion that Pecock views these institutions as "good for the ordinary uninitiated crowd, but we can scarcely think that he regarded them as inspiring to himself."[81] The maintenance of the social and ecclesiastical status quo is the underlying theme of Pecock's entire discussion of pilgrimages and much of his discussion of image use. Despite his friendly and seemingly anti-hierarchical model of "dialogazacioun," his writing on the ritual practices surrounding "seable signes" is committed to the preservation of ecclesiastical and political structures of authority. Moreover, as Michael Camille has argued, while Lollards wanted to replace visual *libri laicorum* with textual ones, the fifteenth-century English church (as Pecock's work suggests) "had a vested interest in maintaining the continuity … of images as centers of power … Images were in this sense inextricably bound up with the status quo, so that to destroy them would be a symbolic act of the destruction of the whole fabric of society."[82] "Seable signes" and the ritual practices surrounding them are intrinsic to the conservative efforts of Pecock's work precisely because of their corporate nature and capacity for mediating and regulating the religious experience of the laity, even if this regulation of

lay piety through visual images works against Pecock's articulated aims of empowering the laity by providing them with vernacular texts.

"ouerhasti iugers": reading the *libri laicorum*

If "heereable signes" and "seable signes" represent the sometimes divergent media of lay education for Pecock, both types of sign require well-trained readers. Pecock's pedagogical program is not limited to the theorization of the varying values and functions of visual and textual *libri laicorum*. It also is concerned with the production of a literate laity, which can read both types of *libri laicorum* well. To be literate, for Pecock, is not simply to be able to read English or Latin texts. Rather, it is to be able to draw on one's rational powers to interpret the sometimes ambiguous signs of the surrounding culture. For Pecock, the opposite also holds true: to be lewd is to misunderstand signs. In other words, Pecock defines "vnlettrid men" not as the illiterate, but as those who "vndirstonden not what þei redyn."[83] Yet Pecock's insistence that the laity be enabled to "leerne bi hem silf" requires an explanation of how it can be that some among the "lay parti" misread the scriptures and misinterpret images. In the *Repressor*, Pecock depicts these poor readers as "ouerhasti iugers" and argues that religious autonomy and access to writings in the vernacular should be denied to anyone who proves him or herself too unlearned.[84] "Be war," he warns, "who euer be war wole; for who euer schewith him lewid, so as is now touchid, he is worthi to be forbode fro entermeting with the Bible in eny party ther of."[85] Thus, in this section, we turn from the nature and functions of the signs themselves to Pecock's understanding of how they should be interpreted.

Before directly stating and responding to the Lollard critiques of images in the second section of the *Repressor*, Pecock outlines nine conclusions of his own about images and nine conclusions about pilgrimages. Nestled within these conclusions are descriptions of rational and hermeneutic rules that ought to be followed, objections to the conclusions, and responses to the objections. The conclusions about images primarily consist of assertions first that images are condemned neither by scripture, tradition, nor the "doom of resoun," second that they are eminently clear and easily interpretable signs, and finally that they are effective in prompting memory.[86] Pecock acknowledges that images may be abused, but dismisses any association of such misuse with idolatry. When images are put to genuinely idolatrous misuse, however, Pecock says their destruction is justified.[87] Even so, the evils that may come from having

and using religious images, he claims, are no greater than those which "occasionarili comen out fro the having and the vsing of profitable craftis and marchaundising; neither gretter than ben the yuelis comyng bi this, that lay men vsen the Bible in her modir tunge."[88]

Moreover, images, like scripture, are misused only when they are misunderstood or misread. As Pecock sees it, this is precisely the problem with the accusations of idolatry made by many Lollards. In making such accusations, Pecock claims, the Lollards reveal their own confusion about the difference between an image and an idol. They are, in other words, poor readers of images. To clarify this point, Pecock offers his own definition of idolatry: "ydolatrie is neuere doon, saue whanne a man takith a creature for his God and worschipith thilk creature as for his God; but so doith no man with eny ymage now in Cristendoom, aftir that the man is come into ȝeeris of discrecioun and is passid childhode, and which is not a natural fool."[89] For Pecock, idolatry is the practical result of "hasty" judgment and semiotic confusion. It is that act of sacrilege in which a person accepts a created thing as a god and worships it as such, and Pecock emphasizes (again echoing Hoccleve) that no rational person in the fifteenth century is capable of such confusion.

In his definition of idolatry, Pecock does not trouble himself or his readers with the subtleties of contemporary distinctions between degrees of veneration. The distinction between *latria* and *dulia* was long used to justify the various postures humans take toward images. Even some Lollard writers employed this distinction.[90] But such distinctions are conspicuously absent from Pecock's account. Also noticeably absent from Pecock's defense of images is any explicit reference to the distinction between an image and its prototype. Rather, Pecock sees this issue as an essentially semiotic and hermeneutic one – a question of how well lay readers can interpret signs. Pecock thus innovatively approaches the question of how to read images by means of analogy with literary rhetoric and hermeneutics.

Pecock's concern with lay reading practices is evident in his allegorized encounter with the daughters of God in the "entry" to *The Reule of Christian Religioun*.[91] These allegorical personifications representing "treuþis of vniuersal philosophie" explain that they have been neglected by the contemporary clergy, who have turned instead to "þe douȝtris of men þat ben worldly trouþis, oolde rehercellis, strange stories, fablis of poetis" and so on.[92] Furthermore, this formal turn obscures a deeper philosophical and theological confusion. They warn Pecock that: "manye oþer opynyouns taken as for foundid in scripture mysvndirstonden … ben takun

forþ, holdun and famed for discreet, wijs, holy and religiose trouþis."[93] "[S]cripture mysvndirstonden," as Pecock understands it, is a confusion of the literal and figural meanings of texts. As we have already noted, Pecock seeks to remedy this hermeneutic confusion by the production of instructional texts such as his (now lost) treatise, *The iust apprising of Holi Scripture*. As Scase has suggested, "Pecock seems to have formed the view that spreading orthodoxy among the erring laity was prevented not by lack of books, but by entrenched reading habits and the ineffectiveness of hearing reforming sermons."[94] These entrenched reading habits include both the literalist hermeneutics propagated by many Lollards and the affective hermeneutics advocated by clerical reformers like Nicholas Love. To counter these reading habits, Pecock attempts to educate his readers in the use of reason, rhetoric, and historical exegesis in approaching both figurative texts and images.

It will not be surprising that, for Pecock, interpretation is first and foremost a rational act. In his view, only "ouerhasti iugers," or those who do not take the time to apply reason to their reading, will misinterpret signs. Yet Pecock also understands that developing good reading habits may come more easily to some readers than others. Even so, he argues that, if given the tools of proper interpretation, the most simple-minded readers should be able to understand texts. For example, in the prologue to *The Donet*, he writes that if a reader is "discounfortid for hardnes of þe mater or of þe langage" of the book, he might turn to the eighth, ninth, and tenth chapters: "and aftirward he haue þese seid chapitris red, y truste to god and to þilk reeders resonable witt þat he schal resceyue into his laboure chereful counfort, him helping, and his drede and dispeir fer aweie putting and banysching."[95] These chapters, Pecock explains, will set the reader's "resonable witt" on the right path toward understanding the remainder of the book. Unlike Lollard writers, Pecock does not claim that scripture and other writings are immediately accessible to all readers, but rather acknowledges potential difficulties and often provides alternative starting places for the varying levels of readers. Since Pecock defines "vnlettrid men" not as those unable to read but as those who "vndirstonden not what þei redyn," such step-by-step instruction in interpretation is essential to his pedagogical program.[96]

Proper interpretation of Pecock's own writing, he suggests throughout his corpus, comes from the application of the methodologies of reason, or syllogistic reading. To this end, he writes, "Lete therfore ech man abide in his resonyng in what euer mater of resonyng he hath to do, in to tyme he be sure that he hath suche seid sillogismes; and he schal neuere

be deceyued. So that al the cause whi men ben deceyued in resonyng is her hastynes."[97] The application of syllogisms to the hermeneutic process, Pecock assures his readers, cannot fail to yield the right interpretation. While Lollard writers often argued that scripture alone contained all philosophy and theology necessary for a holy life, Pecock insisted that scripture was not interpretable without rational exegesis.[98] Such a move from strict biblicism, or literalism, to a form of exegesis informed by rational process is contingent upon the reader's acceptance of Pecock's assumption that scripture is sufficient only as interpreted by philosophy or theology. Again, it is only because readers do not apply the proper process and instead read hastily that they misinterpret both "heereable" and "seable signes."

But Pecock also acknowledges that hermeneutics require a basic knowledge of rhetoric as well, especially when it comes to interpreting figurative language. To this end, Pecock offers his readers an extended summary of rhetorical conventions in the *Repressor*. To describe and justify the "colouris of rethorik," or figures of speech, he appeals to historical precedent:

Fro eeldist daies contynueli hidir to men weren woned forto speke and write her wordis not oonli in treuthe, but also ther with to gidere for to speke and write tho wordis in sum gaynes and bewte or in sum deliciosite; and into this eende and purpos thei vsiden certein colouris of rethorik, that with hem her spechis schulde be the more lusti, and thei ordeyneden summe certeyn figuris rennyng therwith forto excuse tho colourid spechis fro vntrouthe.[99]

Pecock here makes an argument for both literary aesthetics and literary criticism. Writing may be both for "treuthe" and for "gaynes" or "bewte." These aims are not mutually exclusive, as many Lollard writers would seem to argue. Rather, it is precisely the writer's use of figures that "excuse tho colourid spechis fro vntrouthe." Likewise, rhetorical embellishment is like using "spicis and saucis" to make food more delicious.[100] However, the reader must know how to interpret figurative language in order to find the "treuthe" of a passage. To this end, Pecock breaks down the various types of figurative speech with the finesse of a rhetorician or literary critic, defining and giving examples of synecdoche, simile (or "transsumpcion"), metaphor, metonymy, and apostrophe.[101] Thus, he explains, when the gospels say that Christ is a vine, his disciples are branches, and the Father is the farmer, the careful reader will understand that the passage is metaphorical: Christ is "lijk in wirching to a vyne, and hise disciplis weren lijke to braunchis of a vyne," and so on.[102] Having explained the varieties of figurative speech, Pecock applies them to the interpretation of images and of discourses surrounding

them. For instance, he describes prayers to the cross as an example of metonymy: "Forwhi if it be seid or writun to the same crosse in which Crist henge: 'Thou, crosse, aȝenbouȝtist man,' the dewe meenyng and vndirstonding ther of is this: 'Sum persoon aȝenbouȝte man bi thee, cross, in that thou were an instrument forto aȝenbie man.'"[103]

Prayers to the cross, Pecock insists, are, in fact, prayers to Christ. In this context, the cross stands in for Christ. In the following paragraph, Pecock develops this interpretation by citing several well-known prayers to the cross, quoting excerpts, and modeling a figural interpretation. His argument is a simple one: figures (whether they be figures of speech or material figures) should be read *figuratively* not literally. And indeed, he extends this argument for the necessity of reading figures *figuratively* to explain how images ought to be read.

In the *Reule*, Pecock similarly defends the use of figurative language as both a necessary discourse of religious experience and a pedagogical tool. After using a parable to illustrate a point, Pecock justifies his rhetorical choice by appealing to scriptural precedent:

lord, þou techist in þi gospel rewlis þat we schulen leerne and deeme bitwixe vs and þee, þat is to seie leerne and deeme how we schulen bere vs toward þee and how þou wolt bere þee toward vs bi parablis or lijknessis bitwixe kyngis or housholders and her children or meyne in þis world, ffor as myche as alle reson-able trouþis founden amonge creaturis ben not suche trouþis saue for þat þey comen out from lijk to hem in þi godhede, þe euerlastyng trouþis.[104]

Reading figures, like the exercise of reason, requires an understanding of relationality. Corporeal figures, such as parables or images, should be read as pointers toward incorporeal, "euerlastyng trouþis." The platonic overtones to this passage are reminiscent of the traditional image/proto-type argument for devotional artifacts: material likenesses represent non-material platonic forms. Similarly, parables help their readers "leerne and deeme" between what is human or material and what is divine or spirit-ual. Since Jesus used the figurative language of parables in the scriptures, Pecock argues, their continued use is justified. Figurative language helps its interpreter learn how to discern between an image and the reality it represents. Despite its seeming contradiction of his condemnation of excessive literary ornamentation of theological truth elsewhere in his cor-pus, this justification of linguistic signs is important for Pecock because of its easy application to other signs.

Thus, if a layperson knows how to interpret figurative language, Pecock believes that she ought to be able to interpret other sorts of figures – including "seable signes." Lollards, on the other hand, would certainly

have found the application of rhetorical principles to the interpretation of what Pecock calls "seable signes" more problematic. Sarah Beckwith points out that "Wherever possible, the Lollards sought to substitute the clarity of the Scriptures for the idolatrous obscurity of seeable signs."[105] However, Pecock sees images as much clearer signs than texts and thus suggests that those who cannot subject images to the "doom of resoun" should by no means be allowed to tread in the murky depths of scriptural exegesis. Although Pecock assumes that images are more easily interpretable than texts, other contemporary writings on the proper use of images reflect a perceived need for lay education in the interpretation of these visual *libri laicorum*. As we have seen, many of Pecock's clerical and literary contemporaries seek to teach the readers of their texts how to interpret visual signs. While Hoccleve, Lydgate, and Capgrave model their instruction with literary forms, other texts, such as *Dives and Pauper*, explicitly and constructively address the Lollard critique that images are often misunderstood. Pecock insists that such detailed instruction is unnecessary if one is taught by reason how to read visual signs. Like Hoccleve, who claims that the lay ability to reason ensures that the image will not be confused with what it signifies ("For this knowith wel euery creature / Þat reson hath, þat a seint is it noght"), Pecock argues throughout the opening chapters that lay reason is a safeguard against the misinterpretation of images.[106] Thus, there is little point-by-point description and explanation of specific images in his lengthy defense of "seable signes" in the *Repressor* as there is in *Dives and Pauper*, in which Pauper explains the iconographical meaning of a number of popular religious images. Rather, much of Pecock's hermeneutic education consists of reminding his lay readers of what they presumably should already know.

Like Capgrave, Pecock emphasizes the necessity of historically contextualized readings of images. His repetition of "now" and the formulation "in these daies" in passages explaining contemporary image use distances Pecock and his peers from what can clearly be defined as idolatry in the distant pagan and Jewish past. He argues, for example, that "in these daies … the ymagis had and vsid in the chirche … ben had and vsid, not for Goddis, but rememoratijf signes or mynding signes of God and of Seintis."[107] Yet Pecock does not characterize contemporary Christendom as inherently more rational than pagan antiquity.[108] To the contrary, he offers a surprisingly sympathetic explanation of pagan idolatry. He suggests that "hethen men" believed spiritual forms to be most accessible when rendered incarnate. In making this claim, he aligns pagan image worship rather uncomfortably with Christian apologetics that appeal to

the Incarnation of Christ as justification for the production of images. He writes:

these hethen men worschipiden not the pure ymage in it silf as for her God (no more than Cristen men worschipen now the singuler manhede of Crist as for Crist and as for God,) and ȝit the hethen men helden her God to be bodili and bodied in a maner which thei couthen not at fulle vndirstonde, euen as we Cristen men holden now oure God to be bodili and to be bodied in a maner which no Cristen man kan at the ful comprehende and vndirstonde.[109]

In passages such as this, he sounds rather like the pagan philosophers in Capgrave's *Life of Saint Katherine*.[110] Strikingly, he finds common ground between pagan and Christian uses of images, implying the universal power of visual and material forms of piety. Yet he argues that although all humans benefit from material signs, in the contemporary world "so greet doom of resoun hath be founde bothe of hethen men and of Iewis and of Cristen men" that idolatry is no longer a temptation. Indeed, he continues, "now adaies it is not perel to Cristen men neithir to the Iewis neither to hethen men forto haue and entermete with ymagis of God."[111] Pecock simply cannot accept Lollard claims that the laity are prone to confusing the signifier with the signified.

Finally, to demonstrate the semiotic foolishness of anyone who might confuse images with what they signify, Pecock offers a series of commonsense examples to his readers: "Forwhi, if of eny of hem it be askid, whether this ymage is God in heuen, which made al thing, and which was euer withoute bigynnyng, and was therfore eer this ymage was maad; he wole seie anoon, that this ymage is not he, but that this ymage is the ymage of him."[112] Again he emphasizes that, when pressed, "eny" layperson will reveal that he or she understands the difference between an image and what it represents. In so doing, he directly counters Lollard arguments that "summe lewid folc wenen … þat þis ymage of þe crucifix be Crist hymsilf, or þe seynt þat þe ymage is þere sett for lickenesse."[113] Pecock trusts that even the uneducated can distinguish visual signs from what they signify just as they can distinguish figures of speech from literal meanings. He continually rejects the literalism that undergirds Lollard critiques of image use.

Furthermore, Pecock anticipates and responds to heterodox responses to these claims about lay rationality:

Perauenture thei wolen seie thus: Manye hundridis of men clepiden this ymage the Trinyte, and thei clepen this ymage Crist, and this ymage the Holi Goost,

and this ymage Marie … and so forth of othere; and thei wolden not so clepe, but if thei feeliden and bileeueden withinneforth as thei clepen withouteforth; for ellis thei weren double.[114]

Here, Pecock again shows himself to be familiar with the Lollard critics that argue that calling an image by the name of the thing or person it depicts constitutes an equation of the sign with what it signifies.[115] But as we have already seen, Pecock wants to distinguish between the language used to speak of images and the ontological status of the images themselves. While the language used to describe an image might seem to collapse the sign and the signified, Pecock claims that the rational person is using the language figuratively and is not, in fact, collapsing the image and its referent. To make this point more clearly, Pecock provides exemplary proof of the layperson's capacity to distinguish between a visual sign and what it signifies:

Whanne y come to thee in thi parisch chirche thou wolt perauenture seie to me thus: Lo here lieth my fadir and there lieth my graunt fadir … .and ȝit thei liggen not there, but oonli her boonys liggen there. If y come to thee into thin halle or chaumbir thou wolt perauenture seie to me in descryuyng the storie peintid or wouun in thin halle or chaumbre: "Here ridith King Arthir, and there fiȝtith Iulius Cesar, and here Hector of Troie throwith doun a knyt," and so forthe … Schal y therfore bere thee hoond that thou trowist thi fadir and thi graunt fadir and thi wijf for to lyue and dwelle in her sepulcris, or schal y bere thee an hond that thou trowist Artur and Iulius Cesar and Hector to be quyk in thi clooth … ?[116]

Drawing his examples from both the spiritual spaces of the parish church and the secular space of the hall or chamber, Pecock reviles the foolishness of interpreting such associations literally: Caesar and Hector are not *really* alive and fighting on the cloth; Arthur is not riding across the wall. What Pecock's example does not take into account is that in orthodox theology there is a fundamental difference between the representation of what is considered transcendent of sensible reality (such as God) and the representation of human bodies. Whether this is a careless or deliberate omission here is unclear, though such questions are raised in contemporary religious writings, such as those by the anonymous author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*. What is crucial, from Pecock's perspective, is not that the laity debate or even consider the value of representing the ineffable (as the *Cloud* author would have it) but rather that they be reminded to draw on their reason in interpreting religious images.

　　Thus, for Pecock, using signs as "rememoratijf" devices for the education of the laity requires both the truthful representation of the sign and

the thoughtful application of the reader's natural reason. Pecock is interested in reception but insists that audience response can be mediated and regulated by authorial or artistic formal choices. To this end, he develops a prose form suited to "treuþe" – vernacular, syllogistic prose – and uses this form to teach his readers the basic hermeneutic principles necessary for properly interpreting other kinds of signs. In his introduction to semiotics, Pecock thus reminds his readers that all speech is intrinsically metaphorical and, in turn, all images (and especially those made by humans for the express purpose of signification) are referential.[117] But we must also note that he turns from syllogistic to a rhetoric rooted in experience and example when addressing the issue of religious images. Like the images he is defending, Pecock's own formal practices shift to emphasize material and practical rather than abstract and theological modes of argumentation.

"make no cisme": speaking of the *libri laicorum*

In spite of his extended defense of images throughout the second section of the *Repressor*, Pecock ends by offering a qualified concession to the critics of images. He acknowledges that after reading his defense of images some among his audience will argue that although it is lawful and useful for people to have images, it should also be lawful to speak out against the abuses of images and pilgrimages, to refuse to use them, and instead to seek other modes of remembrance. He articulates his understanding of their position as follows:

Thouȝ it be leeful and expedient to manie folk for to haue the seid vce of ymagis and for to do pilgrimagis, ȝit we seen so manye viciose gouernauncis mengid ther with or comyng forth therfro, that we wolen be free forto speke aȝens tho synful gouernauncis. And also, thouȝ it be leeful and expedient to manye folkis forto vce in the seid maner ymagis and forto haunte pilgrimagis, ȝit sithen it is not to alle folk lijk expedient and profitable, and it is not to eny persoon comaundid bi doom of resoun or bi Holi Scripture, we wolen not holde us bounde as bi eny precept of lawe of kinde or of God forto vce ymagis and do pilgrimagis; but we wolen stonde in oure liberte forto be remembrid upon God and hise benefetis and the othere fer bifore rehercid thingis bi suche ymagis and pilgrymagis, or by redingis and heringis of Holi Scripture, or bi inward meditaciouns, or bi talking to gidere of oure neibouris or with oure curat hauyng cure of oure soulis.[118]

Ventriloquizing the "lay party's" position (and playing on the Pauline themes of Christian freedom from the law and submission to it), Pecock urges those making such arguments: "be ȝe siker of the treuthe, bifore ȝe bigynne to vndirnyme it; and whanne ȝe ben ther of sufficientli leerned

and instructid, se ȝe that in ȝoure vndirnymyng ȝe bere ȝou discreetli."[119] This interest in discretion, Pecock soon reveals, is primarily a commitment to avoiding schism or disorder. While allowing some room for individuals to hold alternative positions to those of the church, he demands quiet-ism if they choose such a path: "lette not eny othere persoones forto take the seid vce of ymagis and of pilgrimagis in dew maner; and … make no cisme neither disturblaunce neither debate among Cristen peple bi hold-ing aȝens the seid dew vce of ymagis and of pilgrimagis."[120] If one does not agree with the use of images, Pecock argues, such an opinion should not be voiced publicly, even in the form of friendly debate or perhaps, as Pecock himself called it, "dialogazacioun." Dissenting personal opinions on potentially socially disruptive matters are too potentially destructive to be entertained in either public or private discourse.

 Discretion on matters of personal opinion, however, was not Pecock's strong suit. Indeed, as I have noted, his disregard for ecclesiastical author-ity, his exaltation of the individual's reason, and his outspoken broadcast-ing of these positions arguably led to the condemnation of his work and to isolation and eventual death in Thorney Abbey. In a letter to Henry VI in 1457, Viscount Beaumont argued that Pecock "by sotyll covyns and ymaginatyff wittes sett all [his] studes to hurt our faith."[121] Worried about the social effects of Pecock's assertion of the authority of reason over scripture, tradition, and church authority, the church clearly felt that his teachings threatened the clerical hierarchy and thus social order more broadly. In general terms, as Scase notes, the charge of heresy lodged against Pecock "was linked with the threat of civil disorder and the loss of the monarchy's authority."[122] Although Pecock's written work consistently articulated his commitment to the defense of ecclesiastical institutions against the critiques of the Lollards, it is perhaps because he lacked the very discretion that he advocated that he was the only English bishop to lose his position on the grounds of heresy before the Reformation.

 Pecock's trial for his "heretical" opinions reflects the extent to which the church's fear of placing too much authority or knowledge in the hands of the laity was linked to its fear of division more generally. The threat of schism loomed large on the European horizon and was frequently blamed on the subversive literacy and individualism of heretical sects such as the Wycliffites.[123] Despite his advocacy of lay rationality, Pecock himself warns against the effects of allowing each person to read and interpret the scriptures on his or her own:

many dyuerse opinions schulden rise in lay mennys wittis bi occasioun of textis in Holy Scripture aboute mennys moral conuersacioun, that al the world schulde

be cumbrid therwith, and men schulden accorde to gidere in keping her seruice to God, as doggis doon in a market, whanne ech of hem terith otheris coot. For whi oon man wolde vnderstonde a text in this maner, and an other man wolde vnderstonde it in an other dyvers maner, and the iijᵉ. man in the iijᵉ. maner … eende schulde ther neuere be of her strijf, into tyme that thei schulden falle into fiȝting and into werre and bateil.¹²⁴

Like dogs in a market, the laity will tear one another to pieces, he warns, if allowed free rein with the interpretation of the scriptures. More important, however, as his own accusers suggested, is the social significance of this privatization of piety and hermeneutics. Given his interest in conciliarism, it is not surprising that Pecock abjured at his trial, making a public recantation of his life-work in order to preserve the unity of the civic and ecclesiastical structures that those very texts sought to defend. In fact, as James Simpson argues, it may be precisely because so much of Pecock's argument rested on conciliarism that he "could have no theoretical response to the council that convicted him of heresy."¹²⁵

In his comments on the troubles in Bohemia, Pecock blames the "rewful and wepeable destruccioun of the worthi citee and vniuersite of Prage" on the religious schism brought about by the followers of Hus.¹²⁶ Just as Lydgate implies in *Troy Book* that idolatry led to the fall of Troy, Pecock here suggests that heterodoxy leads to social destruction. Religious unity and the fate of the nation are bound with one another. Emphasizing this point, he cites Christ's dictum that "ech kingdom deuidid in hem silf schal be destruyed" and offers a written plea that "God for his merci and pitee kepe Ynglond, that he come not into lijk daunce."¹²⁷ It is with this emphasis on social unity and exemplary narratives structured by urban experience that Pecock asserts that images must maintain a privileged public role for both the sake of the church and the sake of the state, if not necessarily for the faith of the individual.

Pecock's concerns about schism may not be surprising. It is now a critical commonplace to acknowledge that the first half of the fifteenth century was a time of increased ecclesiastical regulation of lay religious life.¹²⁸ Vernacular literacy and the wider dissemination of theological writings in this setting are often taken as affronts to this increased control.¹²⁹ While Pecock's mode of regulating lay experience with syllogistic, vernacular prose is nontraditional in its participation in this production and dissemination of writings, it also contributes to attempts to regulate lay piety by providing models of orthodox religious practice rooted in physical, corporate experience and marginalizing those who would argue with these models by asking them to remain silent.¹³⁰

Although the fragmentation of the church by splinter sects such as the
Lollards and the Hussites was deeply threatening to an ecclesiastical bur-
eaucrat like Pecock, his social conservatism was always paired with an
equally strong concern for pedagogical reform. This chapter has sought
to demonstrate that Pecock's texts are characterized by the integration of
these conservative and reformist tendencies and reflect the writer's aware-
ness of both the increasing literacy of the laity and their need for the pro-
duction and circulation of what Pecock hoped would be ecclesiastically
endorsed, regulatory religious texts. In the concluding pages, I want first
to return to Pecock's privileging of textual *libri laicorum* for the educa-
tion of the laity over their visual counterparts, and second, to suggest that
through his participation in book circulation schemes such as lending
libraries and common-profit books he inadvertently participates in the
undermining of both visual *libri laicorum* and the ecclesiastical structures
which these "seable signes" support.

Despite his long, careful defense of images in the second part of the
Repressor, Pecock ultimately concedes that images, pilgrimages, and other
physical signs may encourage social and religious unity but that vernacu-
lar religious texts are better suited to the theological and moral educa-
tion of individual laypeople. To this end, Pecock concludes his defense
of images by rearticulating the privileged place texts should hold in the
acquisition of spiritual knowledge:

this y wolde that ech man knewe, (and herto y wolde that ech man toke hede,)
thouȝ the excercise and vce of suche now seid visible signes, doon in deuocioun
and with vndirstonding of tho signes what thei bitokenen, is good and profitable
to be had at certein whilis … ȝit y wole not that men schulden haunte as it were
alwey the excercise in suche visible signes, whanne thei coueiten to be mad spir-
itual, sweete, and deuoute with God, and stronge forto do and suffre for him;
neither that thei haunte so miche or so ofte the vce of suche visible signes, that
thilk haunte and vce lette hem fro vce of a better excercise; and speciali that he
not drenche al the leiser, which tho men miȝten and schulden haue forto reede or
heere the word of God.[131]

Although, as we have seen, images are effective means of prompting devo-
tion and memory, and although they complement texts, Pecock ultim-
ately argues that their use should not stand in the way of the even "better
excercise" of reading or hearing the written word of God. Further, with
his repetition of "haunte," Pecock suggests that the customary use of

images (be it individual or social) may ultimately be more of a hindrance than a help to the spiritual lives of the laity and the church more broadly. As James Simpson has noted, this same position would be articulated in the English Reformation, with reformers arguing that "Images could be reverenced, as long as they were considered merely semiotic, signs alone that carry none of the power of the past into the present, and as long as they remained within the discourses of emotion and personal piety."[132]

The lengthy defense of images in the second part of the *Repressor* concludes with this clear assertion of the pedagogical superiority of the word. The images and other "seable signes" that he has gone to such lengths to defend are ultimately subordinated to texts in perhaps one of the most potent analogies in his corpus:

> For certis, how the sunne passith in cleernes, cheerte, and coumfort the moone, and as a greet torche passith a litil candel; so in these seid pointis reding and heering in Goddis word, which is an excercise in hereable signes ȝouun to us fro God, passith in cleernes of teching and in cheerte of delijt and in coumfort of strengthe ȝeuyng forto do and suffre for God in his lawe keping al the excercise had, or which can be had, in suche now bifore seid visible signes deuisid bi man.[133]

Just as the sun is clearer than the moon and a torch provides more light than a candle, so too, Pecock insists, "reding and heering" surpass all of the "visible signes" which he has gone to such lengths to defend. Texts surpass images, this passage claims, not only by their ability to teach but also in the "delijt" they prompt and "strengthe" they give. Pecock is adamant about this point, claiming his authority to speak on these matters by the power of experience: "The experience had in this mater is so sure, that therefore y am bold forto it knouleche."[134] Yet to end here seems almost an admission of defeat as Pecock implies the central contention of the Lollards once again: If texts are superior modes of learning and of educating the laity, then why not favor them and encourage their use in lieu of image veneration?

As this chapter has shown, Pecock believes that images continue to have some distinct advantages: they remind more quickly, are more easily accessible, and contribute to social unity better than texts. In the examples he gives of corporate image use (claiming that ten thousand books would not work as well in bringing Saint Katherine to mind as does the yearly pilgrimage, and suggesting that twenty thousand books would not be as effective as one day spent commemorating the image of Gravesend) Pecock emphasizes the social importance of the image. Such hyperbole echoes in his conclusion that "writing mai not conteyne and comprehende in him al the avail which the siȝt and the biholding of the

iȝen may ȝeue and is redi forto ȝeue."[135] Yet even while he dismisses the practicality of circulating twenty thousand books, Pecock is interested in the possibilities and problematics of such an ambitious endeavor. Pecock's allusions to "cheyned" books may be indebted to his own participation in the development of lending libraries in fifteenth-century England. During his years in London, Pecock's circle of acquaintances initiated a number of book circulation efforts, including the production of common-profit books and the institution of the Guildhall library. This library and common-profit scheme are distinguished by their patrons' obvious interest in the circulation of vernacular texts among the laity and poor clergy.[136] The common-profit books, as Scase notes, were "books financed by the donor's estate and bequeathed in exchange for prayers for the donor's soul."[137] The books themselves are often compilations of catechetical, moral, and devotional materials in the vernacular.[138]

In his *Book of Faith*, Pecock advances an argument for a variation on the common-profit distribution scheme, calling on the wealthy to finance the production and circulation of ecclesiastically approved, vernacular books (he is likely thinking of his own) among the laity who could not pay for such books themselves. He argues that it is not enough that these books be written, "but tho bokis musten be distributid and delid abroad to manye, where that nede is trowid that thei be delid."[139] Pecock's proposal for the communal circulation of books parallels Lollard reading and book circulation practices, and it seems clear that his aim in creating alternative, orthodox reading communities is at least in part a response to these.[140] As Rita Copeland notes, Lollard systems of book sharing "invite dialogic participation in the activity of teaching."[141] Much like the "dialogazacioun" that Pecock hopes will be created by his books, Lollard "dialogic participation" is often centered on a shared text. For example, in a Lollard sermon based on the fifteenth chapter of Matthew, the speaker (presumably an itinerant preacher) concludes: "Now siris þe dai is al ydo, and I mai tarie ȝou no lenger, and I haue no tyme to make now a recapitulacioun of my sermoun. Neþeles I purpose to leue it writun among ȝou, and whoso likiþ mai ouerse it."[142] This preacher apparently both provided a copy of the written text of his sermon to be perused by his listeners and promised to respond to their questions about (and even suggestions for revisions of) it when he returned. The reading community imagined by this preacher is not entirely different from the sort of reading public imagined by Pecock.

Pecock, however, made his own proposals for a more strictly governed system of propagating vernacular *libri laicorum* among the laity. As we

have noted, Pecock values book ownership in part because the lessons heard in a sermon may not be remembered well by their listeners. Owning a book or perhaps the written text of a sermon gives the layperson the opportunity to read and reread the text until it can be fully comprehended or remembered. Like Lollards concerned about the cost and availability of books, Pecock also desires to produce less expensive and "lasse compendiouse" versions of his own writings. He specifically requests that his *Donet* be shortened and simplified in order that the poorest reader may be able to own a copy of his or her own:

Not wiþstondyng þat I haue maad þe first parti of þe book clepid 'Þe donet of cristen religioun' to be of litil quantite þat welniȝ ech poor persoon maye bi sum meene gete coost to haue it as his owne; ȝit, in to þe moor eese of þe persoon poorist in hauer and in witt, I haue drawen þis now folewyng extract or outdrawȝt fro þe first parti of þe seid 'donet,' þat no persoon cristen growen in to discrecyoun of resoun, or fewe of hem, aftir sufficient pupplisching of þis book to hem, schulde haue eny excusacioun for þis, þat þei knowe not þe lawe and seruice of her lord god. [143]

Pecock emphasizes in this redaction what he has made explicit throughout his corpus: every person who has reached the age of reason should be provided with textual *libri laicorum* so that they have no excuse for not knowing "þe lawe and seruice of her lord." Perhaps his contemporaries would say that this lesson should be taught through other forms of *libri laicorum* more suitable for the laity. Pecock, however, is unswerving in his commitment to make vernacular texts of religious instruction available to all those who desire them.

   As I suggested in the opening lines of this chapter, Pecock's corpus reminds us that the conflict over the status of the vernacular text in the fifteenth century was simultaneously a conflict over the status of the image. To divorce the two forms or to emphasize one and neglect the other, as is common in recent scholarly discussions of vernacular theology, is problematic. Pecock's work throws into relief the extent to which the relationship between word and image remained under pressure into the mid fifteenth century, pulled in one direction by the demands of social and theological conservatism and in the other by increasing lay literacy and the emergence of literalist heterodox sects. This tension affects the way in which vernacular writers represented the spiritual and pedagogical value of word and image throughout the period.

   Thus, Pecock offers us one perspective on the changing relationship between images and texts in the period. Images, Pecock's *Repressor* suggests, may have an advantage in enabling social memory and thus also

contribute to the preservation of social and ecclesiastical structures. Because they are "sensible" or corporeal they facilitate corporate memory. However, vernacular texts serve an equally vital purpose – that of educating an ever more literate laity. Drawing these distinctions helps Pecock negotiate the fraught relations between image use and vernacular textual production in his time. His attempts to articulate the varied uses and values of visual and verbal signs also suggest that Pecock understands, as W. J. T. Mitchell has articulated, that "the dialectic of word and image seems to be a constant in the fabric of signs that a culture weaves around itself. What varies is the precise nature of the weave, the relation of warp and woof."[144] Pecock's writing on the changing relationships between images and texts both affirms the emerging desire for access to vernacular texts (that will come to fruition in the Reformation) and provides justification for the continued use of religious images. In sum, it seeks to set the two types of signs in relation to one another, acknowledging difference while also finding common ground.

Epilogue: words for images
From Pecock to the Protestant Reformation

Although Pecock's defenses of images in the 1450s represent the last extended discussion of image use in English before the Protestant Reformation, the issue continued to be a contested one in the final years of the fifteenth century. Heresy trials from this period provide an especially rich source of evidence for the continued debate. When Richard Heghan was questioned about his beliefs in a heresy trial in Coventry in March of 1486, he explained that it is better to give money to the poor than to images of Christ and the saints, which he describes as nothing more than lifeless wood and stones. To emphasize the sheer materiality of a local cult image of Mary, he added that if it "were set alight, it would make a good fire."[1] Robert Falks, another suspect at Coventry, stressed the absurdity of venerating the image of Mary by boasting that "If it cothe speke to me, I wolde gyfe hit an halpeni worth of ale."[2] And yet another heretic on trial that day, John Blumston, argued that veneration of the Virgin Mary may occur just as appropriately in the kitchen as in shrines, and people might venerate her "as well through seeing their mother or sister as through visiting images [which are only] dead sticks and stones."[3] But despite the evidence of continued heresy trials, as Margaret Aston has shown, "Lollard iconomachy neither caused nor enabled Reformation iconomachy."[4]

To be sure, while the voices of dissent grew quieter in the last decades of the fifteenth century, religious writing was increasingly being produced and circulated in the vernacular, especially after the advent of printing in England in the 1470s. At the same time, extant church decoration from the late fifteenth century suggests that vernacular texts, and even vernacular poetry, were sometimes painted on the walls of churches either alone or accompanying images. As I suggested above, a number of Lydgate's poems were conceived as imagetexts and painted in both ecclesiastical and secular spaces. Architectural imagetexts can also be found in the *Pricke of Conscience* window at All Saints, North Street in York and the Marian altarpiece at York Minster.[5] These combinations of image

and poetry, however, are now rare, with most having been erased and destroyed by the iconoclasm of the following century.

Indeed, with the advent of the Reformation in England, devotional texts would soon replace devotional images in cathedrals and parish churches across England. This model of substitution insisted on the essential difference of visual and verbal signs, and on the supremacy of text over image. Reformation religion has often been characterized as the victory of the word over the image. Yet the association of the two modes of signification remained alive and debated throughout the first decades of the sixteenth century. Arguing against Tyndale's critique of images in the 1531 second edition of his *Dialogue Concerning Heresies*, Thomas More makes a case for images as "the bokys of lay people."[6] Similarly, in a 1533 sermon, Bishop Hugh Latimer notes that he approves of images as "laymen's books."[7] *Dives and Pauper*, with its extended dialogue on proper and improper use of images, was printed in 1536.[8] Yet within two years, the official position of the English church on images was iconoclastic. With the Reformation Injunctions, Cromwell required the removal of images from English churches and advocated whitewashing wall paintings and covering them with verses of scripture, commanding, for example, that "the monuments and tabernacles where images did stand and namely over the place called the High Altar be taken down with most convenient speed, and the said place to be ordered that the same may also be painted with sentences of Holy Scripture."[9] Similarly, many of the Injunctions order churches to have religious books displayed and open for the parishioners to see and the Decalogue written or painted in a place where all can see and read.[10] Michael Camille has argued that "iconoclasm inaugurated a far more fundamental change in the balance of power – from image to word. Protestantism reified language as the means of communication between man and God, and so instead of images painted in churches, texts of Scripture were placed there."[11] The Injunctions made official this change from visual regimes to textual ones, advocating iconoclasm on the one hand and bibliophilia on the other.[12] The century of widespread iconoclasm that follows these Injunctions is well known. Indeed, this has been where most studies of the debates between images and texts in early English literature begin.[13]

However, as this book has sought to demonstrate, fifteenth-century religious writing offers a remarkably fertile ground for the exploration of the relationship between religious images and religious writing. The fifteenth-century writers I have considered reveal the richness and complexity of the debate about the pedagogical and spiritual values of images

and texts. To argue for the fifteenth century as a time of vibrant religious debate and as a time of experimentation with aesthetic theory and literary style is to remember that reformation is always bound up with attention to form – both material and textual. Fifteenth-century attempts to reform the image were perhaps more subtle than those a century later, but for precisely this reason they can offer us a model of reform committed to renewal of the past rather than its rejection, and to aesthetic education rather than iconoclasm.

Notes

1 The best overview of this association is Duggan, "Was Art." But on this topic see also Nichols, "Books-for-Laymen"; and Gill, "Reading Images." Theorists of visual culture have also long sought to analyze the association. See, for example, Lessing, *Laocoon*; and W. J. T. Mitchell, *Iconology*, 43.

2 Belting, *Likeness*, 1. See also Kamerick, *Popular Piety*, 1.

3 Barnum (ed.), *Dives and Pauper*, I.82/37–44.

4 Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 26.

5 On fifteenth-century reform, see Gillespie, "Vernacular Theology," esp. 416–18.

6 On the flexibility of the concept of "image" in the Middle Ages, see Brown, "Images," 307; Minnis, "Medieval Imagination"; and Brantley, "Vision."

7 *MED*, "reformation."

8 See, for example, Gillespie's discussion of the vernacular *tituli* for a now lost Marian altarpiece, in "Medieval Hypertext." See also the opening claim of Marks, *Image*, 1; and the second part of Duffy, *Stripping*.

9 The important exception to this claim is Dimmick *et al.* (eds.), *Images*. An excellent recent study of the collaboration of image and text is Brantley, *Reading*. On this topic, see also Gill, "Reading Images," 18–19. In her excellent consideration of late fourteenth-century writing about images, Sarah Stanbury gestures toward this tension, but also focuses on the rhetorics of desire and affective piety in the period's "culture of spectacle." See Stanbury, *Visual*.

10 Gibson, *Theater*, 6. Also see Beckwith, *Christ's Body*, 45–77.

11 On the association of "vernacularization" with the period's emphasis on Incarnation, see Watson, "Conceptions." For a recent reconsideration of the boundaries of "vernacular theology," see Gillespie, "Vernacular Theology."

12 Simpson, *Reform*, 383.

13 Throughout this book I will use the adjective "orthodox" simply to mean those theological positions espoused by the ecclesiastical hierarchy in England in the fifteenth century. As this project demonstrates, the line between orthodox and heterodox in this period is a very fine one (if it even exists in any definable way at all) that problematizes the very use of such terms.

14 Belting, *Likeness*, 1.

15 *Ibid.*, 144; and Barasch, *Icon*, 96. For the biblical condemnations of idolatry, see Exodus, 20:4 and *Liber Sapientiae*, 13–15. All citations of the English Bible will be of *The Holy Bible: Douay-Rheims Version*. All biblical references in Latin are to *Biblia Sacra Vulgata*.

16 Belting, *Likeness*, 145.

17 For analyses of the sources and development of this metaphor, see Duggan, "Was Art"; and Nichols, "Books-for-Laymen."

18 "Idcirco enim pictura in ecclesiis adhibetur, ut hi qui litteras nesciunt saltem in parietibus uidendo legant, quae legere in codicibus non ualent" (Gregory, *Registrum Epistularum*, 9:209). Complete (if not entirely accurate) translation of these letters can be found in Gregory, *Selected Epistles*, 23.

19 Duggan, "Was Art," 230. The defense of images in the Eastern church offered a decidedly more subtle set of distinctions and theological justifications. In the East, images were understood not simply as books for the illiterate; rather, they supersede texts because their corporeal nature facilitates an experience with the incarnate Christ. This apologetic based on the Incarnation of Christ would be used frequently in late medieval discourses on the validity of images. For discussion of the Eastern debates, see Belting, *Likeness*, 146–48. For another account of the controversies, see Pelikan, *Imago Dei*; and Barasch, *Icon*. See also John of Damascus, *Three Treatises*.

20 Belting, *Likeness*, 150.

21 *Ibid.*, 298, 533. See also Schade, "Libri Carolini"; Gero, "*Libri Carolini*"; Chazelle, "Matter"; and Ugolnik, "*Libri Carolini*."

22 An edition of this letter is available in Verminghoff, *Monumenta*, 475 ff. On the ninth-century Paris synod that produced the *libri*, see also Martin, *History*, 252–57; Hilmo, *Images*, 25; and Belting, *Likeness*, 534–35.

23 The Carolingian rejection of the veneration of images hinged on a misunderstanding of the distinction between *latria* and *dulia* (the result of a poor translation that rendered both as *adoratio*) in producing the *Libri carolini*. See Ugolnik, "*Libri Carolini*," 3.

24 Jones argues that, in practice, the Western church quickly forgot the "suspicions and hesitations concerning images" expressed in the *Libri*. See Jones, "Lollards," 27.

25 M. R. James notes two possible authors of the treatise: Adam of Dore (an English Cistercian) and Bernard of Cluny (author of the poem *De contemptu mundi*), in "Pictor in Carmine," 145.

26 *Ibid.*, 141.

27 *Ibid.*, 142.

28 Eco, *Art*, 6–8. See also Belting, *Likeness*, 304.

29 Bernard of Clairvaux, *Apologia ad Guillelmum Abbatem*, in *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, vol. III, 80–108. A partial translation is given in Rudolph, *Things*, 10–12.

30 Coulton, *Art*, 330–36, 371–87.

31 This is as true for Bernard of mental images as it is of physical images. See Ringbom, *Icon*, 16–17; and Hamburger, "Visual," 162, 166.

32 Part of this regulation of sensory excess was found in "how to" manuals for makers of religious artifacts, such as Theophilus' *De Diuersis Artibus*. For a discussion of the aesthetic implications of this text, see Hilmo, *Images*, 2–3.

33 This concern is expressed in some late medieval English devotional texts as well; see, for example, *Cloud of Unknowing*.

34 Aquinas, *Scriptura*, III.312. In his commentary on Lombard's *Sentences*, Bonaventure also articulates this tripartite justification. See Duggan, "Was Art," 232.

35 "Pictura namque plus videtur movere animum, quam scriptura" (Durand, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, Lib. 1, cap. iii, sect. 4).

36 Gibson, *Theater*, 12–15.

37 On the study of medieval emotion, see McNamer, "Feeling." See also Woolf's discussion of affect, images, and the religious lyric, in *English*.

38 A notable exception is Carruthers' work on the mnemonic use of images throughout the Middle Ages in *Book of Memory*, and *Craft of Thought*.

39 Woolf, *English*, 184. See also Aston, *Lollards*, 115. On Bernardine devotional practice, see Duffy, *Stripping*, 234–38; and on the effect of the "incarnational aesthetic" on late medieval representations of Christ, see Aers and Staley, *Powers*, 15–42.

40 Duffy notes that Love's translation of the *Meditaciones* was likely the most popular book of the fifteenth century in England (*Stripping*, 235). See also Love, *Mirror*. For a recent reading of the text as a contribution to the contemporary conversations about images, see Stanbury, "Nicholas Love's *Mirror*," in *Visual*, 172–90.

41 See Stevens, *Four Middle English*. See also Beckwith, *Signifying*.

42 Gibson, *Theater*, 6.

43 Mâle, *Religious Art*, 81.

44 Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 213.

45 For a discussion of orthodox fourteenth-century writers who critiqued images, see Jones, "Lollards," 28.

46 For a more comprehensive treatment of Wyclif's views on images, see Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 98–104.

47 "Et patet quod ymagines tam bene quam male possunt fieri: bene ad excitandum, facilitandum et accendendum mentes fidelium, ut colant devocius Deum suum; et male ut occasione ymaginum a veritate fidei aberretur, ut ymago illa vel latria vel dulia adoretur, vel ut in pulcritudine, preciositate aut affeccione impertinentis circumstancie minus debite delectetur" (Wyclif, *De Mandatis Divinis*, 156). Translation given in Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 99.

48 For similar academic discussions, see Eco, *Art*, 99–103. On the equation of the beauty of a form with its correspondence to the truth, see especially Eco's comments on Bonventure, 103.

49 "In secundo errant plurimi putantes aliquid numinis esse subiective in ymagine, et sic uni ymagini plus affecti quam alteri adorant ymagines, quod indubie est ydolatria" (Wyclif, *De Mandatis Divinis*, 156–57).

50 "Ideo licencia constituendi ymagines preter auctoritatem scripture est dili-
gentissime laicis exponenda, non solum dicendo quod potest bene fieri, quia
sic potest operacio qua contra tercium mandatum sabbatum dissolvitur, et
contra quodcunque mandatum prevaricatur, sed oportet in particulari dili-
genter exponere periculum et profectum" (*Ibid.*, 158).

51 The most thorough overview of Lollard positions on images remains Aston's
work. See *Lollards*, esp. chapter 5; and *England's Iconoclasts*.

52 Hudson (ed.), *Two Wycliffite Texts*, 58.

53 Jones, "Lollards," 29.

54 On the effects of the Constitutions on subsequent vernacular theology, see
Watson, "Censorship"; and for a more wide-ranging discussion of censor-
ship and vernacular revelatory writing in England from 1329 to 1437, see
Kerby-Fulton, *Books*. For the Constitutions' approach to images, see Wilkins
(ed.), *Concilia*, iii.317–18. Interestingly, university theologians ceased to
write academic refutations of Lollard ideas after the first three decades of
the fifteenth century. On Oxford respondents in the fifteenth century, see
Catto, "Theology after Wycliffism," 275.

55 Aston, *Lollards*, 143.

56 For discussion of this treatise, see Jones, "Lollards," 37–40; and Kamerick,
Popular Piety, 28 ff. On Dymmok's response to the *Twelve Conclusions*, see
Somerset, "Answering the *Twelve Conclusions*," in *Clerical Discourse*, 103–34.

57 Dymmok, *Liber*, 182.

58 *Ibid.*, 183–84.

59 The statement survives in two copies, one complete (Assisi, Biblioteca
Comunale, MS 192, fols. 133–46) and one unattributed and lacking a begin-
ning (British Library, MS Harley 31, fols. 182–94^v). For information on
Palmer, see Hudson, "Palmer, Thomas." I am grateful to Mishtooni Bose for
bringing this source to my attention.

60 Netter, *Doctrinale*, esp. vol. iii, 902; and Shirley (ed.), *Fasciculi*, esp. 370–72.
Hudson notes that Netter represents the last of the Latin orthodox refuta-
tions of Wyclif in England: see *Premature Reformation*, 447.

61 Watson, "Idols and Images," 97. For the treatise itself, see Hilton, *Latin
Writings*, vol. 1. This treatise, as Watson notes, is attributed to Hilton in
only one of its five extant manuscripts. For arguments for Hilton's author-
ship, see Clark, "Walter Hilton"; and Russell-Smith, "Walter Hilton."
On Hilton's depiction of images in his *Scale of Perfection*, see Gillespie,
"Images."

62 Hilton, *Latin Writings*, vol. 1, 192. Watson, "Idols and Images," 110.

63 Kamerick, *Popular Piety*, 37.

64 Quoted in Duggan, "Was Art," 234. The French original is in Gerson,
Œuvres complètes, vol. 7, 963.

65 On Carpenter, see Owst, *Destructorium*; and Kamerick, *Popular Piety*,
19, 38.

66 Hamburger, "Visual," 163.

67 Barnum (ed.), *Dives and Pauper*, 1.85–86/1–23.

68 See, for example, Mirk, *Mirk's Festial*. See also Wakelin, "Note."

69 Love, *Mirror*, 10. For a discussion of the representation of the imagination and knowledge in Love's *Mirror*, see Karnes, "Nicholas Love."

70 For a consideration of the use of vernacular, pastoral writings to regulate and direct lay piety and religious practice, see Rice, *Lay Piety*.

71 Camille, "Seeing."

72 Tristram, *English*, 4.

73 Gillespie, "Medieval Hypertext," 216.

74 Camille, "Seeing," 37.

75 The examination of these relations in the last quarter of the fourteenth century is already underway. Most recently, Stanbury has explored Chaucer's response to the critique of images in *Visual*, 95–152.

1. LOLLARD ICONOGRAPHIES

1 Scarry, *On Beauty*, 114.

2 Hudson (ed.), *Lollard Preacher*, 112, lines 2293–95. The second part of the phrase is also found in Swinburn (ed.), *Lanterne of Liȝt*, 37: "for God is in no place faire serued; but þere as his lawe is faire kept of þe peple."

3 On Wyclif's position on images, see pp. 9–10 of the Introduction above. Here and throughout, I will use the term "Lollard" to describe the full range of writings advancing theological concepts that generally do not conform to late medieval orthodoxy. This term thus includes writing that is clearly affiliated with Wycliffite ideas but is also intended to encompass other late medieval writings in the "grey areas" between heresy and orthodoxy. On the stakes of naming, see Cole, "Wycliffism is not 'lollardy' " in *Literature*, 72–75; and Hornbeck on "the terminology of late medieval dissent," in "Development," 16–28.

4 For recent discussions of Lollard ideas about images, see Stanbury, *Visual*, 7–32; and Kamerick, *Popular Piety*, 13–34.

5 Jones, "Lollards," 29. See also Kamerick, *Popular Piety*, 21–22. For an overview of Lollard doctrine, see Hornbeck, "Development." For more general overviews, see especially Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, and more recently, Rex, *Lollards*. For a consideration of the diversity of Lollardy, see Somerset's forthcoming "Afterward."

6 Cigman (ed.), *Lollard Sermons*. All citations from the edition will be cited parenthetically in the text by page and line number. I have silently regularized Cigman's use of italics and brackets. On the dating of the collection, see Cigman, "Luceat," 482.

7 While Aston and Hudson have carefully detailed the positions Lollard writers might take on the question of images, in this chapter I extend their descriptions to ask some larger questions about the literary implications of Lollard ideas about images. See Aston, *Lollards*, and *England's Iconoclasts*. This chapter is substantially indebted to Aston's pioneering work on Lollard ideas about images and texts.

8 As Barr discusses, in many Lollard texts, Christ himself becomes "the holy exemplar of praiseworthy indigence." See Barr, "Wycliffite," 199. On kenosis and late medieval vernacular religious writing, see Watson, "Conceptions."

9 Lollard writing is often represented as at odds with the period's "incarnational aesthetic" and forms of imaginative piety. On this topic, see Gibson, *Theater*, 6; Nissé, "Reversing," 165; and Stanbury, *Visual*, 174–82.

10 For many Lollard writers representational clarity, in other words, is not in fact "largely achieved by setting aside the visual." See Little, "Images," 114. Little's larger point, however, is compelling: "the debate over images is always as much a debate over the nature of signs and the role of the interpreter as it is about the veneration of images" (115).

11 In 1880, one of the earliest editors of Lollard writings, F.D. Matthew, commented that "It cannot be denied that there is a certain sameness, which makes these tracts rather tiresome to read continuously." See Wyclif, *English Works*, xlviii. For commentary on this and other early formal assessments, see von Nolcken, "Certain Sameness," 192. Simpson's monumental work on "reformist literary practices" in late medieval England largely ignores Lollard texts, describing them as "set out to be discursively stable, unimaginative, and instrumental" (*Reform*, 371). In an essay-length response to Simpson's book, Holsinger notes this absence and makes an argument for the "aesthetics" of Lollard texts. See Holsinger, "Lollard." Justice, in an overview of "Lollardy," argues that Lollards were "positively suspicious of aesthetic pleasures" ("Lollardy," 679). See also von Nolcken, "Some Alphabetical," 273. A number of other scholars have recently begun to reassess these assumptions about the formal considerations; see especially the collection of essays in the special section "Langland and Lollardy," in *YLS* 17 (2003). For a brief comment on Lollard resistance to "formalism," see Watson, "Censorship," 826, n.11.

12 For a more detailed examination of these assumptions, see my forthcoming essay, "Lollard Writings."

13 Similarly, in his discussion of *ekphrasis* in *Pierce the Ploughman's Crede*, Holsinger suggests that the poem's "literary style and mode are coterminous, even consubstantial with the ecclesiology they embody" ("Lollard," 80).

14 Discussions about the image in late medieval England are usually also discussions about form and representational modes. For a brief consideration of late medieval theories of form, see Cannon, "Form." See also Minnis, "Literary Forms," in *Medieval Theory*.

15 Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 68/65–66, 69/95. On the complexities of Wyclif's approach to scriptural truth, see Ghosh's discussion of *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae* in *Wycliffite Heresy*, 22–66.

16 The sermon claims to be citing Augustine here, but the exact source is not clear. Helen Barr discusses the use and misuse of signs in this passage and in the *Piers Plowman* tradition more generally in *Signes*, esp. 58–60.

17 Von Nolcken (ed.), *Rosarium*, 101.

18 British Library, MS Harley 2398, fol. 80ᵛ. In moderate texts such as this, the Wycliffite affiliations are somewhat questionable. For an argument for the

Lollard affiliations of this particular treatise on the Decalogue, see Aston, *Lollards*, 153–56. For a more general consideration of writings in "the grey area" between heterodoxy and orthodoxy and a suggestion of criteria for their evaluation, see Havens, "Shading."

19 Compston (ed.), "Thirty-Seven Conclusions," 743.

20 The treatise on "Images and Pilgrimages" in Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 83, makes the same argument.

21 Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 103–04/265–71. There is some critical disagreement over the Lollard affiliations of this text.

22 *MED*, "curious." Compare the *Rosarium*'s entry for "Edifiyng" for a similarly constructed list of qualifications (von Nolcken (ed.), *Rosarium*, 69/4–10).

23 Variations of this argument are found across Lollard writings; see Cronin (ed.), "Twelve Conclusions," 300; and the treatise on "Images and Pilgrimages," in Hudson, *Selections*, 83–84.

24 Swinburn (ed.), *Lanterne of Li3t*, 85.

25 On the differing assessments of visual and verbal signs, see Little, "Images."

26 Von Nolcken (ed.), *Rosarium*, 100/19–22.

27 Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 27. This passage is a direct translation of Wyclif, *De Mandatis Divinis*, 156. See also the treatise on "Images and Pilgrimages" in Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 83.

28 "On the Minorites," in Robbins (ed.), *Historical Poems*, 163.

29 As Kerby-Fulton and Despres point out, this passage exemplifies Lollard mockery of the "literal absurdity of traditional pictorial devices" (*Iconography*, 38). For the aestheticizing of the crucifix in a roughly contemporary text, see the late fourteenth-century poem *Meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ*, ed. D'Evelyn, 19/699–738.

30 In his defense of images against the Lollard critique, Roger Dymmok takes issue with precisely this sort of reasoning. See Dymmok, *Liber*, XIII.4 (p. 188).

31 Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 83–84.

32 Brantley, *Reading*, 152–53.

33 The full poem is found in Ross, "Verses"; these are lines 17–20, 25–26. See also R. H. Bowers, "Middle English Verses." On scholastic ideas about the beauty of Christ, see Eco, *Aesthetics*, 122–25.

34 Margery Kempe similarly describes Christ as "most semly, most bewtyuows, & most amiable þat euyr might be seen with mannys eye" (Kempe, *Book*, 8).

35 On medieval ideas about truth and representation, see Morse, *Truth*; and Beer, *Narrative*. On medieval interest in "true" visual images, see Belting, *Likeness*, 49–58, 208–24.

36 Love, *Mirror*, 10–11. On this point, see Gibson, *Theater*, 10; Simpson, *Reform*, 436; and Karnes, "Nicholas Love," 398.

37 As for their contemporaries, there remains a great deal of common ground between textual "images" and material images; the concept of "image" refers to both meanings. See Brown, "Images," 307; Minnis, "Medieval Imagination"; and Brantley, "Vision."

38 The passage continues: "And just as such a confrontation of opposites makes the beauty of the style, so the beauty of the universe is fashioned through

confrontations of opposites, in a style which does not deal in words, but in things" (Augustine, *City of God*, xi.18).

39 Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria Nova*, 39–40.

40 Barr, *Signes*, 100.

41 Other scholars have made similar points about the antagonism of Lollard polemic. See, for example, Nissé, "Reversing," 170; Little, *Confession*, esp. chapter two; Watson, "Vernacular," 120; Ghosh, *Wycliffite Heresy*, 145; and Holsinger, "Lollard," 77.

42 Most early reviews of Cigman's edition questioned the sermons' Lollard affiliations. See, for example, Frankis, "Review," and Edwards, "Review." The orthodoxy of the sermons has been re-evaluated recently by Hornbeck in "Lollard." On the vocabulary of these sermons as characteristically Lollard, see Cigman, "Luceat," 484–86. Although they do not directly reference Wyclif, I would argue that they are characterized by what has been called "Lollard sect vocabulary," they clearly draw on the *Rosarium*, and they engage with issues often represented in Lollard texts, such as the critique of images, friars, and ecclesiastical endowment, and emphasize repeatedly the importance of "true" preaching. One surprising literary feature of the sermons, which I have explored elsewhere, is a prose style so carefully structured and strongly alliterative that it often sounds like Langlandian long-line verse. See Gayk, "As Plouȝmen."

43 This, and all of the examples that follow, are traditional bestiary associations. See White (trans.), *Bestiary*. See also Rowland, *Animals*.

44 For a consideration of the mnemonic capabilities of images, see Carruthers, *Craft of Thought*.

45 Nicholas Love's full description of the entry reads: "A lorde Jesu what siht was þis to se þe kynge of kynges & lorde of alle þe worlde ride in siche araye, namely in to þat solempne Cite of Jerusalem. Bot soþely þis þou diste as alle þine oþere dedes to oure enformacione & ensaumple. For we mowe se & vndurstande þat in þis manere of worldes wirchipe taking þou despisede fully al þe pompe of veyn worldes wirchipe, hauyng instead of golden harneys & curiouse sadeles & brideles simple cloþes and hempen heltres" (Love, *Mirror*, 139–40).

46 See "The General Prologue," i.168–71, in *Riverside Chaucer*. I am grateful to Maura Nolan for suggesting this resemblance to me.

47 Remarkably similar descriptions are given in critiques of prideful prelates elsewhere in the collection. See Cigman (ed.), *Lollard Sermons*, 23/417–30, and 137–38/ 215–46.

48 See Owst, *Literature*, 48–50; Gill, "Preaching"; and Spencer, "Sermon Literature," 165.

49 Mirk, *Mirk's Festial*, 201.

50 *Cleanness*, in Andrew *et al.* (eds.), *Pearl Poet*, 148/1075–76 and 1079–80. In *Pearl*, the poet similarly emphasizes the courtliness of Mary; see especially 64/424 ff.

51 Andrew *et al.* (eds.), *Cleanness*, 150/1081–86.

52 The series of questions is a frequent Lollard rhetorical mode, intended to draw attention to spiritual ideals and their corruption. A case in point is the polemical prose tract *Jack Upland*. See Heyworth (ed.), *Jack Upland*.

53 Love, *Mirror*, 38. Cf. Mirk, *Mirk's Festial*, 24. For an alternate reading of the representation of the Nativity in these sermons, see Ford, *John Mirk*, 80–85.

54 While, as Barr argues, "Lollard texts are not alone in using Christ's humble birth as an example of praiseworthy rural poverty," they are distinguished by "the use of this image as an argument against the temporal endowment of the church" ("Wycliffite," 200).

55 *Pierce the Ploughman's Crede*, in Barr (ed.), *Piers Plowman Tradition*. All quotations from the *Crede* will be cited parenthetically in the text by page and line number.

56 Scattergood, "Pierce," 80.

57 Barr, *Signes*, 53.

58 The majority of interest in the poem, however, has been in its "Langlandianism." See Hudson, "Epilogue," 255–56; Lawton, "Lollardy"; and von Nolcken, "*Piers Plowman*."

59 Peikola, "*Pierce*," 274–75; Duffy, *Stripping*, 272–73; and Copeland, *Pedagogy*, 134–35.

60 Scattergood, "Pierce," 84.

61 Holsinger, "Lollard," 82.

62 On this point, see Scattergood, "Pierce," 85–86.

63 Swinburn (ed.), *Lanterne of Liȝt*, 37. I have modernized the punctuation here and in subsequent citations from the *Lanterne*. This passage closely follows the description in the entry on "Edifiyng" in von Nolcken (ed.), *Rosarium*, 70/15–22.

64 Swinburn (ed.), *Lanterne of Liȝt*, 38.

65 It should be noted that not all early readers of this poem read the ekphrastic passage as *critical*. As Doyle noted, this passage (lines 172–207) was excerpted and circulated separately in London, British Library, MS Harley 78, fol. 3ʳ (a collection of ostensibly orthodox historical and religious prose and verse in English), apparently selected out of appreciation of its poetry rather than any religious agenda. See Doyle, "Unrecognized."

66 Swinburn (ed.), *Lanterne of Liȝt*, 41.

67 Holsinger argues similarly (but more strongly) that the poem uses aesthetic "beguilement to instill a critical awareness of clerical wealth and the idolatry of visual culture" ("Lollard," 83).

68 Justice similarly reads this as a "concrete and detailed imagination of poverty" ("Lollardy," 678). It has also, however, been read as a vulgarization and sensationalization of Langland's plowman. See, for example, Salter, *Fourteenth-Century*, 100.

69 Scattergood, "Pierce," 80.

70 *MED*, "quainte." On Chaucer's use of "queinte" as an aesthetic signifier that throws into relief the artificial or human-made quality of a work, see Nolan, "Beauty," 213.

71 The appropriation of this verse is common in Lollard writings on images, see also "Tractatus de Pseudo-Freris" in Wyclif, *English Works*, 299/20; and Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 75.

72 Forshall and Madden (eds.), *Holy Bible*, vol. 1, 31.

73 Swinburn (ed.), *Lanterne of Liʒt*, 15.

74 *Dialogue between Jon and Richard*, in Somerset (ed.), *Four English Wycliffite Dialogues*, 22/721. I am grateful to Professor Somerset for sharing the pre-publication manuscript of this edition with me.

75 Somerset (ed.), *Jon and Richard*, 23/731–43.

76 On this point, see also the entry on "Edifiyng" in von Nolcken (ed.), *Rosarium*, 68–71.

77 Cf. Swinburn (ed.), *Lanterne of Liʒt*, 40.

78 Somerset (ed.), *Jon and Richard*, 23/731–43.

79 Somerset (ed.), *Jon and Richard*, 14/419–34. This image is, of course, a relatively common one in medieval literature, with the most well-known example deriving from the early Middle English *Ancrene Riwle*. On this topic, see Whitehead, *Castles*.

80 Somerset (ed.), *Jon and Richard*, 23/755–56.

81 Scarry, *On Beauty*, 114.

82 *MED*, "faire."

83 Von Nolcken (ed.), *Rosarium*, 70/9–11.

84 Cf. Simpson, *Reform*, 378.

85 Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 27/99–100.

86 *The Plowman's Tale*, lines 909–14, in Dean (ed.), *Six Ecclesiastical Satires*.

87 "[M]elius fuit erogare pecunias pauperibus quam decimas dare presbiteris vel offerre ymaginibus beate Marie et melius esset offerre ad ymaginem Dei creatam quam ad ymaginem Dei pyktam" (McSheffrey and Tanner (eds.), *Lollards*, 72).

88 Swinburn (ed.), *Lanterne of Liʒt*, 38. On robbing from the poor to donate to images, see Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 124–25.

89 Hudson (ed.), *Two Wycliffite Texts*, 18/559 ff.

90 Hudson (ed.), *Two Wycliffite Texts*, 58. Reginald Pecock ventriloquizes this position in the mid fifteenth century. Cf. Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 193.

91 Ghosh, *Wycliffite Heresy*, 116.

92 I have reformatted this passage to call attention to its alliterative patterns. In its manuscript contexts and in Cigman's edition it is represented as prose.

93 Somerset, "Expanding," 84.

2. THOMAS HOCCLEVE'S SPECTACLES

1 Marion, *God without Being*, 9.

2 "Nam si velis scire singulatim, nuntio tibi quam grave est scribere pondus. Oculis calignem facit, dorsum incorbat, costas et ventrem frangit, renibus dolorem immittit et omne corpus fascidium nutrit" (quoted in Frugoni, *Books*, 149).

3 Hoccleve, *Regiment of Princes*, lines 1023–29. Unless otherwise noted, all citations of the *Regiment* are of this edition and will be given hereafter in the text by the abbreviation *RP* and line number.

4 See *RP*, lines 1014–22, for these specific complaints. For discussion of the labor of writing in this passage and others in the *Regiment*, see Knapp, "Poetic Work."

5 The most thorough consideration of the history of eyeglasses remains Rosen, "Invention." In a sermon preached at the beginning of the fourteenth century, the Italian Dominican Giordano da Pisa raved about the "new art" of making eyeglasses, "which let one see clearly, which is one of the finest and most necessary arts the world has" (quoted in Frugoni, *Books*, 2).

6 My brief descriptions here are indebted to the many early images of spectacles provided in Frugoni's *Books*, 7–25. On the earliest appearances of eyeglasses in art, see Rosen, "Invention," 204–05.

7 Hoccleve, "Balade to my Gracious Lord of York," in *Minor Poems*, 49–51, lines 55–58.

8 Petrarch, unlike Hoccleve, ultimately uses glasses. For his comments, see Petrarca, *Letters*, 5.

9 On the fifteenth-century guise of dullness, see Lawton, "Dullness."

10 See, for example, Akbari, *Seeing*, 3–10.

11 On these discourses, see Newman's excellent essay, "What Did It Mean." See also Hamburger, *Visual*, esp. Chapter 2.

12 Tachau, *Vision*, 6.

13 Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, 146.

14 "Address to Sir John Oldcastle," in *Minor Poems*, 21, line 427. I follow M. C. Seymour's *Selections from Hoccleve* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991) in titling the poem *The Remonstrance Against Oldcastle*. However, all citations of the *Remonstrance* are of Furnivall and Gollancz's edition and will be given hereafter in the text by the abbreviation *RO* and line number.

15 Hoccleve, *Complaint and Dialogue*, *Dialogue*, lines 190–96. Patterson makes a similar point about Hoccleve's understanding of Health in *La male regle* as the social health of England, in "What is Me?."

16 In this approach to subject/object relations, we might read Hoccleve as offering a medieval version of "thing theory." For recent discussions of the agency of things and the reciprocity of objects and their subjects, see the essays of Bill Brown's special issue on "Thing Theory," *Critical Inquiry* 28:1 (2001). For recent considerations of medieval "thing theory," see Stanbury, *Visual*, 17–32; and Robertson, "Medieval Things."

17 An important exception is Bryan's discussion of Hoccleve as a devotional writer in her recent book, *Looking Inward*, esp. 176–203. Other recent considerations of Hoccleve continue to insist on his secularity; see, for example, Tolmie, "Professional"; Meyer-Lee, *Poets*; and Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*. Older, but still influential, studies are Strohm, "Chaucer's"; Scanlon, "King's"; Lerer, *Chaucer*; and Hasler, "Hoccleve's."

18 While his interest in bulwarking Lancastrian orthodoxies is often cited, Hoccleve's personal piety has, at best, been of relatively little importance to modern critics and, at worst, read as a careful manipulation of religious

conventions to support his political and financial agenda. See, for example, Pearsall, "Hoccleve's," 404; Nissé, "Oure Fadres"; Bryan, "Hoccleve"; and Little, *Confession*.

19 The sole reference in the *MED* is to Hoccleve's use of the term. See *MED*, "unsight."

20 Pearsall, for instance, stresses the "urgent topical relevance of Hoccleve's attack on Lollardy in relation to the prince's anxiety to represent himself as the champion of orthodoxy" ("Hoccleve's," 403).

21 Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, 145–46.

22 Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, 134; Cole, "Thomas Hoccleve's Heretics," chapter 5 of *Literature*, 103–30.

23 On the *speculum* genre, see Torti, *Glass of Form*, esp. 89 and 104–05. On the use of *exempla* within these collections, see Scanlon, *Narrative*, esp. chapters 2 and 10. Although Hoccleve's *Regiment* is in the *Secretum* tradition, it offers a provocatively different approach to basic epistemological questions. The dating of the *Regiment* has been a subject of debate. Internal reference to the burning of John Badby (lines 281–329) indicates that the poem was written after March 1410 and the address of the poem to Prince Henry indicates that it must have been completed before his accession to the throne in March of 1413. For a general chronology of the relevant events, see Burrow, *Thomas Hoccleve*.

24 John Bowers reads Hoccleve's inclusion of the Chaucer portrait as "dismantling Chaucer's potentially disruptive relationship with Wycliffism and rewriting it as orthodox resistance" ("Thomas Hoccleve," 355). See also Seymour, "Manuscript"; Pearsall, "Hoccleve's," 401–04; and Perkins, "Thomas Hoccleve," 595.

25 For example, Charles Blyth, in his notes to the Medieval Institute Publications edition, comments: "how absurd to think the portrait of a secular poet would have anything to do with icons in churches and their opposition by Lollards" (Hoccleve, *Regiment of Princes*, 248).

26 The first phrase comes from Brown, "Images," 313. The second is from Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, 131. This reading can also be found in Pearsall, "Hoccleve's," 398.

27 Nissé, "Oure Fadres," 287.

28 McGregor, "Iconography," 344.

29 Brown also comments on the reciprocal relation, in "Images," 314.

30 On "imagetexts," see W. J. T. Mitchell, *Picture Theory*, 83–107; and Brantley, *Reading*, 5.

31 On medieval theories of imagination, see Minnis, "Medieval Imagination."

32 Biernoff's book, *Sight*, provides an excellent distillation of medieval optical theory. See also Denery, *Seeing*.

33 Akbari, *Seeing*, 24.

34 Crombie, *Science*, 305.

35 For useful introductions to Grosseteste's writings, see Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste*, 135–88; and Callus, "Robert Grosseteste."

36 On the relationship between vision and cognition throughout the Middle
   Ages, see Pasnau, *Theories*. See also Karnes, "Nicholas Love," 390.
37 Eastwood, "Mediaeval Empiricism," 309.
38 *Ibid*.
39 Biernoff, *Sight*, 67.
40 For additional general background, see Lindberg, *Theories of Vision*, 116–46,
   and "Lines of Influence."
41 More generally, Bacon's synthesis offered a new "guide to the relation of
   perceiver to the perceived not simply in vision but in general" (Crombie,
   Science, 316).
42 Biernoff, *Sight*, 3. See also Tachau, *Vision*, 8.
43 On the theological and psychological implications of the study of optics for
   Bacon and the other perspectivists, see Biernoff, *Sight*, 68.
44 *Ibid*., 133. On the transformative effects of visual reciprocity, see also Belting
   (to whom Biernoff is responding), *Image*, 80–83.
45 Biernoff discusses this relationship in the last chapter, "Ocular Communion,"
   of her book *Sight*, 133–64.
46 Nissé, "Oure Fadres," 287.
47 *Ibid*.
48 *MED*, "sensibilite."
49 London, British Library, MS Harley 2343, fol. 18.
50 Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, 147.
51 Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, 139.
52 Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, 82.
53 Waugh gives detailed historical description of the events leading to Oldcastle's
   conviction, escape, and subsequent recapture and sentencing in an old, but
   still useful, two-part essay, "Sir John Oldcastle." Other assessments include
   McFarlane, *John Wycliffe*; and Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, 65–86.
54 Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, 134.
55 Cigman (ed.), *Lollard Sermons*, 114/311–17.
56 Lollard writers applied this argument to the seeming vivacity of images,
   explaining that they, lacking "life & witte," were inhabited and given
   miraculous qualities by "vnclene spiritez" (von Nolcken (ed.), *Rosarium*, 97).
   I consider this argument in greater detail in Chapter 4, "John Capgrave's
   material memorials."
57 On this passage, see also Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, 141.
58 Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 87/157–58.
59 Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, 141.
60 *Ibid*., 183. See also Tolmie, "*Prive Scilence*."
61 Hammond proposed this title in *English Verse*.
62 All citations of the *Complaint* and *Dialogue* are of Hoccleve, *Complaint and
   Dialogue*. When citing the *Complaint* and lines 1–252 of the *Dialogue*, my
   citations are of Burrow's editorial restoration rather than his parallel tran-
   scription of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Selden Supra 53. Citations of the
   final three poems in the *Series* are of Hoccleve, *Minor Poems*.

63 Simpson, "Madness," 20.

64 Biernoff, *Sight*, 8.

65 A more common early approach to the poem was source study. For representative studies, see Rigg, "Hoccleve's *Complaint*"; Burrow, "Hoccleve's *Complaint*"; and von Nolcken, "O, why." More recently, critics have been interested in the role of subjectivity and interiority in the compilation. See especially the work of Burrow, "Poet," "Autobiographical," and "Hoccleve's *Series*." See also Thornley, "Middle English"; and Lawes, "Psychological."

66 Knapp argues that Hoccleve depicts scenes of "Boethian disenchantment" that are soon disrupted by the entrance of the social world into his solitude. See Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, 164–65.

67 It might also be argued that the source of this "dirke shour" is the withdrawal of patronage. As much of the remainder of the *Complaint* suggests, it is likely that Hoccleve is also mourning the loss of royal favor and patronage and making a plea for renewed support.

68 As Rigg has shown, Hoccleve seems to have derived both his use of the Psalm and the "pattern of suffering, purgation, and divine justice" from Isidore of Seville. See Rigg, "Hoccleve's *Complaint*," 570–71. For further elaboration of Hoccleve's use of Isidore, see Burrow, "Hoccleve's *Complaint*."

69 Julian of Norwich, *Book of Showings*, vol. 1, chap. 1, line 7.

70 Milton, "Sonnet xix," in *Complete Poems*, 168.

71 On Hoccleve's use of the term "spectacle" here, see the gloss in *Complaint and Dialogue*, 96n. Also cf. *MED*, "spectacle."

72 This statement also echoes the old hag's assertion in Chaucer's "Wife of Bath's Tale": Poverty, she argues, "Maketh his God and eek hymself to knowe. / Poverte a spectacle is, as thynketh me, / Thurgh which he may his verray freendes see." This excerpt is taken from a much longer discourse on the benefits of poverty that comes at the conclusion of the tale (*Riverside Chaucer*, iii.1201–04).

73 Manzalaoui (ed.), *Secretum secretorum*, 98.

74 *Ibid.*, 96.

75 This passage is often read as highlighting Hoccleve's personal fragmentation. See, for example, Patterson, "What is Me?" 444. Knapp suggests we read a pun in the term "bukkissh" that suggests the role books played in Hoccleve's descent into insanity (*Bureaucratic Muse*, 163).

76 A loose translation of John of Arderne's tract is given in R. Rutson James, *Studies*, 41–49.

77 *MED*, "halk."

78 "Franklin's Tale," in *Riverside Chaucer*, v.1119 and 1121.

79 Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, 134–37.

80 For a reading of the scene as "a virtual parody of the scene of devotional self-examination," see Bryan, *Looking Inward*, 182–84.

81 A common reading of this scene is along the lines of Mills, who writes that "the mirror also serves as a text which he seeks to read as others read it, and which he tries to emend" ("Voices," 96–97).

82 On the relationship between judgment and "visual epistemology," see Lowe, *Desiring Truth*, 8.

83 Ockham's influence on subsequent literature, and especially Chaucer's corpus, has been noted by a number of scholars. See, most recently, Akbari, *Seeing*, 20. For other readings of the relationships between late medieval optics and literature, see Peck, "Chaucer"; and Kimmelman, "Ockham."

84 An excellent introduction to Ockham's doctrine of "intuitive cognition" is Adams, "Intuitive." On this topic, see also Tachau, *Vision*, 115–23, and Pasnau, *Theories*, 31–62.

85 Tachau, *Vision*, 131.

86 Hoccleve may be following Chaucer here. Akbari (and others) have argued that "Chaucer's rejection of the link between seeing and knowing is based on the skepticism engendered by the claim that species do not exist, made by Ockham earlier in the century" (*Seeing*, 20). Knapp also reads Hoccleve's poetry as being "infected by both theological and scholastic skepticism" (*Bureaucratic Muse*, 134).

87 Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, 171.

88 Though the metaphor as it is used here indicates obscured interior vision, in an age in which optometry was developing, the murkiness of cataracts might similarly be described as a "dirk clowde." For a discussion and description of cataracts and glaucoma by a late medieval physician, see Grassus, *Wonderful Art*, 72–73.

89 Medcalf, "Inner and Outer," 135.

90 See Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, 175. Simpson has also argued that it is the insufficiency of this religious model that is thrown into relief by the intrusion of the friend ("Madness," 24).

91 The invitation to "come and see" also recalls a common invitation in the gospel narratives. See, for example, John, 1:39, 46.

92 Burrow, "Hoccleve's *Series*," 262.

93 Simpson, "Madness," 21.

94 Hoccleve, *La Male Regle*, in *Minor Poems*, lines 329–31.

95 Hilton, *Scale of Perfection*, line 1968.

96 Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, 143.

97 Hoccleve is not alone in excerpting and translating this section of the *Horologium* in fifteenth-century England. It exists in several other translations, including the Carthusian manuscript, British Library, Addit. MS 37049. For discussion of this version and its related images, see Brantley, *Reading*, 259–67. Suso's *Horologium* was also loosely translated as *The Treatise of the Seven Points of True Love and Everlasting Wisdom*. On the circulation of Suso's *Exemplar* and *Horologium* in England, see Wichgraf, "Suso's *Horologium Sapientiae*"; and Lovatt, "Henry Suso."

98 Hamburger, *Visual*, 203–04, 275.

99 Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, 132.

100 Hamburger, *Visual*, 197.

101 *Ibid*., 233–34.

102 For discussions of the relationship of Hocclevе's translation to its source, see the series of articles by Kurtz, "Source," "Prose," and "Relation."

103 Patterson, "What is Me?" 449.

104 Burrow, "Hoccleve's *Series*," 266.

105 Page numbers are cited here as no line numbers are given for the moralization.

106 All citations of "How to Learn to Die" will be given hereafter in the text by the abbreviation *LD* and line number.

107 "speculum sine macula Dei maiestatis, et imago bonitatis illius" (Wisdom, 7:26). On Wisdom as a mirror, see Torti, *Glass of Form*, 3.

108 See, for example, Proverbs, 1:7, 9:10, 15:33, and Psalm 111:10.

109 For a short discussion of the relationship between Suso's *Ars moriendi*, Hoccleve's translation, and other fifteenth-century examples of this genre, see von Nolcken, "O why," 29. On the *Craft of Dying* and other English *artes moriendi*, see O'Connor, *Art of Dying Well*; and Comper (ed.), *Book of the Craft of Dying*.

110 For example, one of the main Latin apologists for images in this period, Roger Dymmok, favored images over texts because images, he believed, have the ability to imprint themselves in a unique way on the human psyche because of the ordering of the human senses. For a brief discussion of Dymmok's explanation of the unique efficacy of images, see Kamerick, *Popular Piety*, 30–32.

111 Love, *Mirror*, 10.

112 Von Nolcken,"O why," 29.

113 Kurtz, "Relation," 270; and Jerome Mitchell, *Thomas Hoccleve*, 42. Von Nolcken asserts that "we should read the *Series* with *Lerne for to Dye* in mind" and thus read Hoccleve's translation of the *Ars moriendi* as a personal preparation for death ("O why," 33).

114 Hoccleve, *Minor Poems*, line 330. In this self-depiction, Hoccleve follows the lead of Suso, whose *discipulus* is also an image of a younger self. See von Nolcken, "O why," 29.

115 The EETS edition does not provide line numbers for this prose addendum and thus I have cited the page number parenthetically.

116 Biernoff, *Sight*, 102.

117 When compared with contemporary Middle English versions of this moment in *The Craft of Dying*, Hoccleve's epistemological uncertainty is even more striking. See Brantley, *Reading*, 261.

118 "How to Learn to Die," for example, is found excerpted from the *Series* in London, British Library, MS Harley 172, fols. 73–88, and San Marino, CA, Huntington Library, MS HM 744, fols. 53–68ᵛ. For a list of manuscripts, see Burrow, *Thomas Hoccleve*, 50–54.

119 Von Nolcken, "O why," 42.

120 On this translation, see Appleford, "Dance of Death."

121 Nissé, "Oure Fadres," 280.

122 See Jerome Mitchell, *Thomas Hoccleve*, 125.

123 Tolmie, "*Prive Scilence*," 285.

3. JOHN LYDGATE'S REFIGURATIONS OF THE IMAGE

1 Levertov, "Origins of a Poem," in *Claims for Poetry*, 260.

2 Pearsall, *John Lydgate*, 68. The most recent articulation of this position is Cooper, "Markys."

3 Almost a century ago, Hammond briefly considered Lydgate's curious habit of writing visual texts, in "Two Tapestry Poems." Pearsall has also suggested that Lydgate often works in the "borderland" between image and text, but although he suggests that "providing words for pictures (the opposite of *ut pictura poesi*) is a characteristic occupation of Lydgate's," Pearsall does not see this exploration as intentional (*John Lydgate*, 174). See also Cornell, "Purtreture." Most recently, Cooper and Denny-Brown (eds.), *Lydgate Matters*, offers a set of new readings of Lydgate's relationship to material culture.

4 On the series of translations between image and text undergone by *The Dance of Death*, see Simpson, *Reform*, 53–64. For the material and social contexts of this poem, see Appleford, "Dance of Death."

5 These material metaphors are especially apparent in the prologue to *Troy Book*. See Lydgate, *Troy Book*, especially lines 120–303. For discussion of Lydgate's emphasis on poetry as craft, see Ebin, *Illuminator*, 32.

6 "The Image of Pity," in *Minor Poems*, 297–99, lines 37–40. Hereafter initial references are cited as *Minor Poems* and line numbers are inserted parenthetically in the text.

7 Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 87, lines 1, 14–15.

8 Love, *Mirror*, 45. This is just one of many references to the differing abilities of the laity and the clergy in spiritual understanding in Love's translation of the *Meditationes vitae Christi*. For a recent re-evaluation of the sophistication of imaging techniques in the *Mirror*, see Karnes, "Nicholas Love," 380–408.

9 Love, *Mirror*, 10. See also Watson, "Censorship," 854, and "Conceptions," 95.

10 Woolf, *English*, 184. For representative studies of late medieval religious images and the production of affect, see Marks, *Image*, 11–37; Belting, *Image*, 41–64; and Kamerick, *Popular Piety*. For influential readings of the status of visual, affective piety in the period's literature, see Bynum, *Holy Feast*, 23–30; Gibson, *Theater*, 1–18; Beckwith, *Christ's Body*, 45–55; and LeVert, "Crucifye."

11 Simpson, *Reform*, 453–54. Woolf also finds in Lydgate's propensity for poems on devotional images a central example of the increased allusion to external visual objects and decreased descriptive detail in fifteenth-century religious lyrics (*English*, 183).

12 For "incarnational aesthetic," see Gibson, *Theater*, 6.

13 On the conflation of the incarnational aesthetic with language politics, see Watson, "Conceptions," 86–91.

14 On Lydgate's "reformist textual practices," see Simpson, *Reform*, 62.

15 For further discussion of Lydgate's figural theology, see Cole, *Literature*, 146–52.

16 For political readings of Lydgate, see Patterson, "Making Identities"; and Scattergood, *Politics*. For influential readings of Lydgate's relationship to Chaucer, see Strohm, "Chaucer's"; Pearsall, "Chaucer and Lydgate"; Lerer, *Chaucer*; and Meyer-Lee, *Poets*, esp. chapter 2.

17 In his survey of Lydgate scholarship, Edwards found it surprising that Lydgate's shorter religious poems had been little studied. Since the publication of Edwards' survey, there have been several essays treating Lydgate's religious poetry, but the subject is still awaiting full treatment. See Edwards, "Lydgate Scholarship." On Lydgate as theologian, see Cole, *Literature*, esp. 133–36.

18 Lydgate's religious poems are frequently given attention in volumes that do not fall within the standard definitions of "Lydgate scholarship." For example, Gibson briefly discusses Lydgate's "Testament" in relation to the piety of the Clopton family, in *Theater*, 84–90. Woolf compares the style and thematic interests of Lydgate's religious poetry to those of other fifteenth-century lyrics in *English*, 198–202, 208–10. Simpson and Scanlon's collection of essays on Lydgate contains a number of considerations of his religious poetry: see, in particular, Nissé, "Routhe"; and Somerset, "Hard is with seyntis."

19 On Lydgate and "orthodox reform," see, most recently, Gillespie, "Vernacular Theology," 417–18; Cole, *Literature*, chapter 6.

20 On Lydgate's time in France, see Pearsall, *Bio-bibliography*, 25–28, and *John Lydgate*, 172–79. On the painting of the poem and image at St. Paul's, see Appleford, "Dance of Death."

21 Lydgate, *Pilgrimage*, xi. All line citations are from this edition.

22 Most critics assume that Lydgate's translation was completed after Montague's death in 1428 since it lacks his traditional dedicatory envoy. Though it may not have reached the hands of its intended recipient, the didactic poem appealed to fifteenth-century literary tastes, and manuscript evidence suggests it circulated in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; it was also printed by Caxton in 1483. For description of the manuscripts, see the introduction to Lydgate, *Pilgrimage*.

23 Walsingham, *Chronicon Angliae*, 377.

24 On the Cistercian concern about excesses in the visual art and ornamentation of churches, see Eco, *Art*, 6–8; and Belting, *Likeness*, 304.

25 Direct references to image-making and idolatry are absent from the poem's first recension. Deguileville penned three versions of his *Pèlerinage*. The first recension of the poem was written in 1331 but, as Deguileville writes in the prologue to the second recension, was stolen from him and circulated widely despite his wishes to the contrary. This first version had also been translated into Middle English by the time that Lydgate was commissioned to translate the second recension. Deguileville revised the poem in 1355 and also wrote the *Pèlerinage de l'ame*. In 1358, he finished his trilogy with the *Pèlerinage de Jhesucrist*.

26 Camille, "Iconoclast's Desire," 153. See also Hagen, *Allegorical*, 97.

27 My argument here is indebted to Camille's foundational readings of the representation of idolatry in the poem, in *Gothic Idol*, 292–97, and "Iconoclast's Desire." Cooper reads Lydgate's poem as even more conservative than Deguileville's insofar as it seeks to "subdue the potential implications of its source text" and serves as "a piece of anti-Lollard propaganda" ("Markys," 96, 102–04).

28 On the mirror image in the prologue to the *Pilgrimage*, see Hagen, *Allegorical*, 7–29.

29 I am not the first to see this as the poem's goal. Tuve first suggested that the poem is fundamentally concerned with teaching the reader how to read allegorically (*Allegorical Imagery*, 146). See also Hagen, *Allegorical*, 4.

30 Hagen, *Allegorical*, esp. chapter 2, "Reason, Token, Eyes, and Ears."

31 Russell, "Allegorical."

32 Camille, "Iconoclast's Desire," 155.

33 See Woolf, *English*, 184–274.

34 Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 250, 290.

35 See Schiller, *Iconography*, 27–30.

36 Camille points out an additional ambiguity in the manuscript's illumination: the English illuminator also highlights the blurred lines between image veneration and idolatry by representing the churl's hands clasped together as if in the posture of Christian prayer. See Camille, "Iconoclast's Desire," 162.

37 On the allegorical practice of the poem, see Steiner, *Documentary*, 41–42.

38 As Camille points out, here "the words of the image-maker become indistinguishable from the words of the contemporary Lollard. The idolater and the iconoclast share the same deranged desire" ("Iconoclast's Desire," 166).

39 Kolve, *Play Called Corpus Christi*, 3.

40 Aston, *Lollards*, 139. For Wyclif's views on images, see pages 9–10 above.

41 See, for example, Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, iii.9.

42 See "Images and Pilgrimages," in Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 84–88.

43 Barnum (ed.), *Dives and Pauper*, i.91/2–3.

44 See especially the poems included in "The Virtues of the Mass," *Minor Poems*, 84–116.

45 As Duffy notes, these sorts of instructional guides to participation in the mass were commonplace by the fifteenth century. See *Stripping*, 19.

46 Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 116–17, lines 1–4.

47 On the mental apprehension and memorial value of images that cannot be easily visualized, see Brantley, *Reading*, 131–33.

48 This threat is remarkably reminiscent of the promise of beheading prompted by the saintly Alban's iconoclastic speech in *Alban and Amphibal*. See Lydgate, *Life of Saint Alban and Saint Amphibal*, lines 2424–30.

49 Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 297–99. All citations of "On the Image of Pity" will hereafter be given parenthetically in the text by line number.

50 Woolf, *English*, 393. Woolf's book contains an extraordinarily helpful introduction to the history of the pietà in an appendix, noting both the prevalence of the image in late medieval England and its ambiguous beginnings

(392–94). On the popularity of the pietà in England, see Marks, *Image*, 121–43.

51 As the extra-biblical pietà was apparently a particular favorite of the icono-clasts, there are few extant English versions. The popularity of the image, however, has never been disputed. Woolf points out that the "Pietà group-ing and complaint were not part of the traditional narrative meditation," noting its absence in literary accounts as diverse as the mystery cycles, the *Cursor Mundi*, and the *Meditaciones vitae Christi* (*English*, 392). For add-itional background on the development of the pietà in England, see Morgan, "Fourteenth-Century England," 51–57.

52 Marks, *Image*, 143.

53 Schiller, *Iconography*, 180.

54 On this narrative isolation, see Woolf, *English*, 255.

55 On the multiple temporalities of medieval art and literature, see Dinshaw, "Temporalities."

56 Mâle, *Religious Art*, 123. For further background on the pietà, see Schiller, *Iconography*, 179–81.

57 Along these lines, Fulton has recently suggested that "praying to the Virgin … forced medieval Christians to forge new tools with which to *feel*." See Fulton, *Judgment to Passion*, 197.

58 "Who can not wepe, com lerne of me," in Furnivall (ed.), *Hymns*, 126–27.

59 See Kempe, *Book*, 148.

60 This mode of experiential memory and affective identification is also evi-dent in contemporary poetic representations of the pietà. A fifteenth-cen-tury lyric in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 189, for example, has the Virgin petitioning the reader: "wepe for my dere sone, which one my lap lieth ded."

61 Lydgate's familiarity with Nicholas Love and reliance on the *Meditaciones* has been posited by Gallagher, in Lauritis *et al.* (eds.), *Life of Our Lady*, 97–142.

62 Of the aesthetics of Lydgate's Marian poems, Pearsall helpfully suggests "The heaping-up of invocation, epithet, image, and allusion is meant to overwhelm with excess, hardly to be comprehended. The aim is not to stir devotion, but to make an act of worship out of the elaboration of the arte-fact" (*John Lydgate*, 268).

63 Fulton, *Judgment*, 208.

64 Leclercq, *Love*, 73. For a more recent description of the gathering and lay-ering mnemonic process of monastic *lectio* and *meditacio*, see Carruthers, *Craft of Thought*, 19–21.

65 Lydgate makes this figural link explicit in another of his Marian poems, "Regina Celi Letare," *Minor Poems*, 293.

66 Lydgate's other Marian lyrics have a similar focus on Mary as queen and intercessor. See, for example, "Ave Regina Celorum," *Minor Poems*, 291–92; and "Stella Celi Extirpauit," *Minor Poems*, 294–95.

67 Clayton, *Cult*, 61–88. See also Fulton, *Judgment*, 218.

68 On the association of Mary with the church, see Morgan, "Twelfth-Century Monasticism," 128–30.

69 On the effects of Lollard attitudes toward confession on contemporary literature, see Little, *Confession*.

70 *MED*, "figure."

71 It is not unprecedented for Lydgate to employ the term to describe a piece of writing. For example, he applies the term "fygure" to a psalm, in his introduction to his verse translation of *De profundis*: "Thys psalme in viij David doth devyde, / A morall fygure of viij blyssidnessys" (*Minor Poems*, 79, lines 41–42).

72 By the middle of the fifteenth century, however, clerical writers often privilege the mnemonic function of images. Reginald Pecock, for example, frequently defends the usefulness of "seable rememoratijf signes." See Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 209; and Chapter 5 of this book, "Reginald Pecock's *libri laicorum*."

73 Cornell, "Purtreture," 169.

74 Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 250–52. All citations of "The Dolerous Pyte of Crystes Passioun" will hereafter be given parenthetically in the text by line number.

75 Mâle, *Religious Art*, 81. For a short listing of the appearance of the image in England, see Duffy, *Stripping*, 108–09. Classic studies of the *imago pietatis* are Endres, "Darstellung"; and Panofsky, "Imago Pietatis."

76 Schiller, *Iconography*, 197. Though the concept of Christ as Man of Sorrows would have been familiar through the liturgy, the roots of this particular visual representation lie in Byzantine art, since the probable prototype of the *imago pietatis* was a small thirteenth-century mosaic icon at the church of Santa Croce that was likely brought to Rome from the East. For additional background on the emergence and transmission of the *imago pietatis* and its relation to the mass of Saint Gregory, see Schiller, *Iconography*, 198–99; Mâle, *Religious Art*, 95–100; and Bertelli, "*Image*." Woolf also includes a concise overview of the *imago pietatis* in Appendix E of her book; and Duffy includes a short overview in *Stripping*, 238–40.

77 Belting's *Image* examines the *imago pietatis* as a case study in late medieval art and devotion and includes important historical background. Like Woolf and Schiller, he notes that since the image was "not limited to a particular biographical situation … [it] was able to symbolize the full range of the meditation on the passion" (40).

78 Mâle cites four variations of the image: 1. the nude Christ coming out of the tomb; 2. Christ in the tomb with two angels; 3. Christ with the Virgin and Saint John; and 4. the scene of the mass of Saint Gregory, with the Man of Sorrows on the altar and his blood flowing into the Eucharistic chalice (*Religious Art*, 97–98).

79 On the association with the Gregorian mass, see Endres, "Darstellung," 155. The image of Christ as the Man of Sorrows was often associated with Old Testament references used in the Good Friday mass. See Isaiah, 53:3–5.

80 Another aspect of the clerical use of this image to regulate lay piety is found in its association with indulgences. See Endres, "Darstellung," 142–44.

81 Schiller, *Iconography*, 198.

82 Woolf, *English*, 184–85.

83 Brown (ed.), *Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century*, 227.

84 *Ibid.*, 157.

85 Pearsall, *John Lydgate*, 265, similarly sees Lydgate's poems on the Passion as penitential rather than devotional.

86 Fulton has suggested that, after Anselm, Christians could no longer "look upon the crucified body of their Lord and see primarily an opportunity to pray for help in their adversity and for liberation from the torments of hell" (*Judgment*, 190). This pre-Anselm model, however, is precisely the religious model that Lydgate wishes to revive in his poetry on the Passion.

87 For example, Lydgate uses the term "figure" to indicate a statue in the *Troy Book*: "On whiche þer stood, of figure & visage / Of masse gold, a wonderful ymage," *Troy Book*, 11.1015–16.

88 Smalley demonstrates that several of the "classicizing friars" call short, exemplary descriptions "pictures." See Smalley, *English Friars*, 112. See also Allen, *Friar*, 102–10.

89 Fulton, *Judgment*, 54.

90 Schirmer, *John Lydgate*, 185; Woolf, *English*, 202. Cornell offers another explanation, suggesting that the knight imagery reveals Lydgate's dependence on "the painting to depict the suffering Christ and on the allusive nature of the imagery to add greater depth to his description" ("Purtreture," 172).

91 Woolf, *English*, 202.

92 The representation of the wounded shield is perhaps best known now from its depiction in the illustrated Carthusian manuscript, British Library, MS Addit. 37049, where it is portrayed with substantial variations seven times. See fols. 20ʳ, 24ʳ, 46ᵛ, 58ᵛ, 60ᵛ, 61ᵛ, and 63ᵛ. The *imago pietatis* also appears in this manuscript. Black and white photo reproductions of the illustrations from the manuscript are available in Hogg (ed.), "Illustrated." Brantley's recent book *Reading* offers the first extended reading of the manuscript. On the devotion to the five wounds, see Mâle, *Religious Art*, 102. For the emergence of the "Mass of the Five Wounds," see Pfaff, *New Liturgical Feasts*, 84–115.

93 The Christ-knight image, though commonplace in early religious writings such as *Ancrene Riwle*, was not frequently used in late medieval religious writing. Other than Lydgate's attempt to revive the image, the most notable exception is William Langland's incorporation of the Christ-Knight theme in Passus XVIII of *Piers Plowman*. There has been some critical attention to the appearance of this conquering Christ figure in relation to the allegorical and figural development of Langland's poem. See, for example, Gaffney, "Allegory"; Weldon, "Sabotaged"; and Warner, "Jesus."

94 MacCracken has emended the manuscript's "blood" to "weede" to maintain the rhyme with the following line's "meede." See Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 251.

95 Isaiah, 63:1–6.

96 Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 25. William Herebert (d. 1333) also translated "Vexilla regis prodeunt" but his version supplies the personal, affective appeal lacking in Lydgate's translation. See Herebert, *Works*.

97 Numbers, 13:18–24. Mâle suggests that Augustine was among the first to bring together these two images (*Religious Art*, 112).

98 There is evidence of visual representation of the mystic wine press in fifteenth-century France. On such representations, see Mâle, *Religious Art*, 102–14. The image would have been known in England during this time primarily from textual descriptions. See also Thomas, *Darstellung*; and Weckworth, "Christus."

99 The figure of the pelican is traditionally associated with the Passion; see Lampen, "Pie Pelicane"; and *MED*, "pellican." However, Lydgate, instead of drawing on the bestiary notion of a pelican feeding her children with her own blood, prompts the allusion but uses the image in a slightly different way, having the pelican pierce Christ's "Entrayl" to provide a comparison ("Lik") with the way the reader's heart should be engraved "depe" with this triumph. For further background on the figural and artistic use of the pelican in the Middle Ages, see Bond, *Dedications*, 256–57.

100 Such distancing also protects Lydgate from the logical quandaries inherent in many of the period's lyrics in which a dead Christ speaks from the image, instructing the viewer to behold his wounds and suffering. Cf. "Abide, Ye Who Pass By," in Brown (ed.), *Religious Lyrics*, 59–60.

101 On the association of the image with indulgences, see Endres, "Darstellung," 152–54.

102 Steiner, *Documentary*, 67.

103 Scase has similarly explored the relationship between medieval literature and the juridical discourses of clamour, complaint, and the *ars dictaminis*, in *Literature and Complaint*.

104 On the intersections of legal documents and literary texts in the later Middle Ages, see Richard Firth Green, "Medieval," and *Crisis*; Freeman and Lewis (eds.), *Law and Literature*; and Steiner and Barrington (eds.), *Letter*.

105 For a discussion of Deguileville's use of documents in the *Pèlerinage*, see Steiner, *Documentary*, chapter 1.

106 Chaucer, "An ABC," in *Riverside Chaucer*, 637–40, lines 59–60. See also Steiner, *Documentary*, 48–50, for a discussion of Lydgate's and Chaucer's elaboration on the documents in their translations of Deguileville's texts.

107 See, for example, the envoys of "A Prayer to St. Thomas of Canterbury," "The Legend of St. Gyle," "Cristes Passioun," and "The Virtues of the Mass," all in *Minor Poems*, 115, 143, 173, 221.

108 Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 221, lines 113–16.

109 For the use of tablets containing explanatory *tituli*, see Gray, *Themes*, 47–51. Lydgate's use of this phrase may also be indebted to Chaucer's "Go lytel bok, litel my tragedie" in the envoy at the end of *Troilus and*

Criseyde. Lerer notes that this phrase was one of the favorite citations of Chaucer's fifteenth-century admirers (*Chaucer*, 17).

110 *MED*, "bille." For a discussion of the relationship of legal bills to vernacular poetry, see Scase, *Literature and Complaint*.

111 Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 252–54, lines 26, 29–30.

112 The term "table" is yet another ambiguous term, having both visual and textual associations. See *MED*, "table."

113 Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 238–50, lines 39–40.

114 The manuscript rubric of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 683, emphasizes that this poem is a translation from Latin into English: "Here begynnyth the xv Oys translatyd out of Latyn into Englyssh by damp John Lydgate monk of Seynt Edmundys Bury" (Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 238).

115 This is consistent with the increasing metaphorical use of books to describe Christ's body in devotional texts. For a short summary of the influence of increasing literacy on textual metaphors in devotional writing, see Aston, *Lollards*, 103–05.

116 For full discussions of the *Charters of Christ*, see Steiner, *Documentary*, chapter 5; and Keen, *Charters*, chapter 2.

117 See Clanchy, *From Memory*, 64.

118 The theme of writing with blood was not unique to the fifteenth century. In William Herebert's (*c.* 1270) charter in "Þou wommon boute uere" the legal transaction is guaranteed by the bloody ink "orn of hys wounde." See Herebert, *Works*, 118–20, lines 19–30.

119 Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 329–62.

120 Simpson, *Reform*, 455. On the testamentary features of the poem, see also Boffey, "Lydgate," 51.

121 Simpson, *Reform*, 64.

122 See, for example, H. S. Bennett, *Chaucer*, 141.

123 Gibson suggests that the "Testament" "is a text negotiating between general autobiography and familiar echo of literary and biblical precedent and expectation" (*Theater*, 90).

124 Simpson also notes the textualization here (*Reform*, 455).

125 For a discussion of the various uses of the term "testament" in the late Middle Ages, see Boffey, "Lydgate," 41–42.

126 Simpson, *Reform*, 455–56.

127 For a recent reading of Francis' affective use of images, see Jill Bennett, "Stigmata."

128 Julian of Norwich, *Book of Showings*, vol. 2, chap. III, lines 22–30.

129 Simpson, *Reform*, 455.

130 Woolf, *English*, 207.

131 Simpson, *Reform*, 457.

132 For a text of the discernible fragments of Lydgate's poems at the Clopton Chapel, see Trapp, "Verses." For background on the Clopton family and their relationship to Lydgate, see Gibson, *Theater*, 79–96. On the relationship between the abbey of Bury St. Edmunds and the town of Long

Melford, see Parker, *History*. Chapters III–V, in particular, relate details of the decoration of the church at Long Melford.

133   Gibson and Trapp both note that Lydgate's "Testament" is also paired with "Quis dabit meo capiti fontem lacrimarum?" in British Library, MS Harley 2255, the collection of lyrics that Lydgate made for his abbot William Curtys. Given this connection, Gibson suggests that it is plausible that the Clopton family also owned a manuscript copy of Lydgate's devotional poems. See Gibson, *Theater*, 87; and Trapp, "Verses," 2.

134   Trapp, "Verses," 3.

135   Gibson, *Theater*, 87.

136   Trapp, "Verses," 5. Cf. Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 357.

137   Trapp, "Verses," 6. Cf. Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, 361.

138   Woolf, *English*, 208.

139   Tristram, *English*, 3, 20–22. The stanzas excerpted from "Quis dabit meo" (8, 4, 14, 18, 19) have the similar effect of generalizing the personal applicability of the complaint and emphasizing its affective power by highlighting the sorrow of Mary and the mercy and love of Christ.

140   Trapp, "Verses," 5.

141   Frere and Kennedy (eds.), *Visitation Articles*, vol. II, 320.

142   See, for example, Cox's "Injunctions and Articles for the Ely Diocese," in Free and Kennedy, *Visitation Articles*, III, 301. See also Gillespie, "Medieval Hypertext," at 218n.

143   See Clanchy, *From Memory*, 231–58, for a discussion of the initial distrust of the authority of written documents.

144   Gray, *Themes*, 46.

145   The full rubric in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.19, reads as follows: "Compylyd by John Lydgate monke of berye at the request of a worthye syttesyne of London to be paynted in a parler." The poem itself appears to be arranged to give room for illustration and contains marginalia to that effect as well. It appears that the entire manuscript was meant to be illuminated (at least the initial letters) but never reached the artist. A large space is left open at the beginning of the poem (fol. 157^r) and in the far left of the margin (partially cut off by the binder) is a note that says "a image of a poet." As this has nothing to do with the text, I assume that it is meant as an instruction for the illuminator. The text of "Bycorne and Chechevache" found in Trinity College, MS R.3.20, includes even more detailed instructions for its painting, with the rubrics to each section beginning "Þanne shal be þer pourtrayed." As in R.3.19, the poem is intended to be "peynted or desteyned clothe for an halle. a parlour. or a chamber devised by Johan Lidegate at þe request of a worþy citeseyn of London." For a recent consideration of one of these painted poems, see Floyd, "St. George."

146   Lydgate, *Dance of Death*. The poem exists in twelve manuscripts that fall into two groups, based primarily on the ordering of the personages. For the purpose of comparison, I follow Warren in citing the representative

manuscript (Ellesmere or Lansdowne) from each group when the groups differ. All manuscripts are dated to the second half of the fifteenth century.

4. JOHN CAPGRAVE'S MATERIAL MEMORIALS

1 De Certeau, *Writing of History*, 36.
2 Consideration of this fact famously led Voltaire later to suggest that idolatry is nonexistent. See Voltaire, "Idole, Idolatre, Idolatrie."
3 For an excellent overview of attitudes toward idolatry in the late Middle Ages in England, see Kamerick, *Popular*, esp. chapters 1 and 2.
4 For additional biography, see the two rather different interpretations by Seymour, *John Capgrave*, 201–35, who insists on the poet's dull conservatism and poetic mediocrity; and Winstead, *John Capgrave's*, 1–17, who seeks to redeem Capgrave from such disparaging assessments.
5 Seymour, *John Capgrave*, 216–17.
6 See Milbank *et al.* (eds.), *Radical Orthodoxy*, esp. 2–4.
7 My reading of Capgrave's theological commitments is thus not far removed from Winstead's recent articulation that Capgrave and Pecock represent a mid fifteenth-century "dissident orthodoxy … [that] advocated the return to a more liberal – *and more traditional* – religion" (*John Capgrave's*, xii). Similarly, one of his modern-day editors reads Capgrave as a "kind of latter-day Church Father" (Lucas, "Introduction," in Capgrave, *Abbreuiacion*, xxiv).
8 Heffernan, *Sacred Biography*, 170–71.
9 Indeed, Winstead notes Capgrave's tendency to "idealize the Church of the past as an institution that recognized and respected holiness" (*John Capgrave's*, 74).
10 On orthodox reform, see Gillespie, "Vernacular Theology," 416–18.
11 Recent reassessments of Capgrave's corpus, such as those by Winstead, suggest growing critical consensus that he makes significant contributions to fifteenth-century religious literature. Earlier readers of Capgrave were less generous. Seymour reads Capgrave's verse hagiographies as full of "miracles neatly ordered and suitable for piously uncritical literates. Neither life has anything to recommend it to another audience" (*John Capgrave*, 221). Pearsall also sees Capgrave's *Life of Saint Katherine* as "a continuation of the Chaucer–Lydgate tradition of embellished rhetorical hagiography" characterized by rhyme royal, prologues and envoys, and ample amplification. See Pearsall, "John Capgrave's *Life*," 123.
12 Capgrave, *Life of Saint Katherine*, iv.633. Henceforth all citations will be to this edition and given parenthetically in the text.
13 This phrase is from Greene's *Light in Troy*, 30. For two excellent essays that seek to recover the complexity of temporal awareness in the Middle Ages, see Patterson, "On the Margin"; and Summit, "Topography."
14 On modern readings of medieval historiography, see Spiegel, *Past as Text*, esp. chapter 6. For English histories, see Galloway, "Writing History."

15 On hagiography as historiography, see Lewis, "History"; and Sanok, *Her Life Historical*, 1–23.

16 Heffernan, *Sacred Biography*, 169. See also Hiatt, "Historical Writing," 189.

17 Sanok, *Her Life Historical*, 3, 19.

18 On the influence of Lydgate on subsequent hagiographers and Capgrave in particular, see Seymour, *John Capgrave*, 221; and Winstead, "Saintly Exemplarity," 338–39 and *John Capgrave's*, 137–38.

19 Lydgate, *Troy Book*, Prologue, lines 159–61, 166–70. Henceforth cited parenthetically in the text.

20 See Simpson, "Bulldozing." Similarly, Straker writes that "the poet's function is to preserve the moral truth of his source and to emphasize or 'enlumyn' it with rhetoric" ("Deference," 4).

21 On the use of the language of "craft," see Ebin, *Illuminator*, 32.

22 Lydgate's representation of the poet as truth-teller and theologian may be indebted to contemporary Italian humanists who defended poetry on similar grounds. See, for example, Witt, "Coluccio Salutati"; and Kallendorf, "From Virgil to Vida."

23 In this respect Capgrave is, arguably, more Lydgatean than Chaucerian. On Lydgate's poetic legacy to fifteenth-century writers, and "Lydgateanism" more generally, see Meyer-Lee, *Poets*.

24 Lucas, "Introduction," in Capgrave, *Abbreuiacion*, xciii.

25 *Ibid.*, xcv. As Hiatt points out, the composition of universal histories in late medieval England was "Part of the process of consolidating English as a language of literary composition" ("Historical Writing," 183). On the importance of such genealogies to late medieval history writing (and romance), see Giancarlo, "Speculative Genealogies."

26 Spiegel, *Romancing the Past*, 105.

27 Winstead, *John Capgrave's*, 81.

28 Lucas, "Introduction," in Capgrave, *Abbreuiacion*, lxxvi.

29 Capgrave's ostensible source for the third part of his history (which focuses on England) is Walsingham's *Chronica Maiora*, a history that expresses extreme suspicion of heresy. For a consideration of the relationship between the two chronicles, see *ibid.*, lxxvii–lxxxvii.

30 Winstead, *John Capgrave's*, 75.

31 "Supervacuitas enim hominum venit in orbem terrarum, et ideo brevis illorum finis inventus est. Acerbo enim luctu dolens pater, cito sibi filii rapti faciens imaginem; illum qui tunc homo mortuus fuerat, nunc tamquam deum colere cœpit, et constituit inter servos suos sacra et sacrificia. Deinde interveniente tempore, convalescente iniqua consuetudine, hic error tamquam lex custodita est, et tyrannorum imperio colebantur figmenta" (*Liber Sapientiae*, 14:14–16). For a short discussion of the influence of the *Book of Wisdom* on medieval understandings of idolatry, see Rubiés, "Theology," 574–76.

32 Augustine, *City of God*, VII.18–19, and VIII.26–27.

33 On idolatry in *Fulgentius metaforalis*, see Chance, *Medieval Mythography*, vol. II, 280–304. See also Ridewall, *Fulgentius metaforalis*.

34 "Haec et alia sunt gentilium fabulosa figmenta" (Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, 8.11.89). For additional consideration of Isidore's euhemerism, see Chance, *Medieval Mythography*, vol. I, 141–47.

35 It is thus surprising that it appears so infrequently in Lollard polemics against images. The entry on "ydolatrie" in the Lollard *Rosarium* gestures toward this argument; see von Nolcken (ed.), *Rosarium*, 97/16–34. An incomplete treatise found in York Minster Library, MS XVI.L.2, 70ʳ–73ᵛ, similarly seems to rely on the *Book of Wisdom* in its understanding of idolatry as "spiritual fornication."

36 Cooke, "Euhemerism," 396. For more recent considerations of euhemerism, see Jonathan Sheehan (ed.), special issue of *The Journal of the History of Ideas* 67:4 (2006).

37 Capgrave, *Life of Saint Norbert*, 141/3691–703.

38 Fradenburg, "Making," 28.

39 This critique and its associated examples appear in both Lollard and orthodox discussions of images. See, for example, the description of the idol and idolater in Lydgate's *Pilgrimage*, lines 20835–44 (discussed briefly in Chapter 3).

40 For a brief discussion of euhemerism and demonic incarnation, see Minnis, *Chaucer*, 32–33.

41 "Item dixit dicta Margeria isti iurate quod populus honorat diabolos qui ceciderent cum Lucifero de cello, qui quidem diaboli cum cadendo in terram intrarunt in ymagines stantes in ecclesiis, et in eisdem continue habitarunt et adhuc habitant latitantes, ut populus adorans eosdem sic committeret ydolatriam" (Tanner (ed.), *Heresy Trials*, 49). For discussion of Baxter's explanation and additional background on this position, see Kamerick, *Popular Piety*, 13–15.

42 Aquinas, "Whether the Cause of Idolatry was on the part of man," *Summa Theologica*, II, ii.q.94, art. 4.

43 Ridewall, *Fulgentius metaforalis*, 66.

44 Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 52.

45 On Ridewall's relationship of the fear of death to the origin of idolatry, see Chance, *Medieval Mythography*, vol. II, 287. The driving impulses of fear and flattery behind the origin of idolatry are also central to the euhemerist account given in *Liber Sapientiae*, 14, although the narrative details differ.

46 Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, v.1527, 1533–35 (vol. II, pp. 553–55).

47 Chance (ed.), *Assembly of Gods*, line 1697. Hereafter, lines numbers are cited parenthetically in the text.

48 These are only a few examples of how the poem blames the poets for the origins of idolatry; see also lines 1742–43.

49 Cf. Chaucer, *House of Fame*, in Riverside Chaucer, lines 1477–80. On the truth-telling capacity of poetry as compared to prose, see Minnis and Scott

(eds.), *Medieval Literary Theory*, 113–26. See also Spiegel, *Romancing the Past*, 61; and Beer, *Narrative*, 13–22.

50 Nolan, "Art," 126.
51 De Certeau, *Writing of History*, 36.
52 Gibbs (ed.), *St. Katherine*.
53 Winstead, *Virgin Martyrs*, 165.
54 Bokenham, *Legendys*, 4/127–28.
55 See the introductory discussion in Sanok, *Her Life Historical*, 2–3.
56 Salih, "Introduction," 10.
57 Heffernan, *Sacred Biography*, 6.
58 See, for example, Winstead, "Piety"; and Sarah James, "Doctryne."
59 For an overview of the visual and textual attestations of Katherine's popularity in late medieval England, see Lewis, *Cult*, esp. 45–62. I consider Pecock's discussion of the cult around Katherine in Chapter 5, "Reginald Pecock's *libri laicorum*."
60 Stanbury, "Vivacity." For Knighton's account of Lollard iconoclasm, see Knighton, *Chronicle*, 292–99.
61 See Winstead, *Virgin Martyrs*, 174–76; Sarah James, "Doctryne," 289; Kamerick, *Popular Piety*, 65; Simpson, *Reform*, 424; and Stanbury, "Vivacity," 139.
62 Winstead, *Virgin Martyrs*, 17.
63 Similarly, Patterson, "On the Margin," 93, suggests that anachronism might be a "way of staging an act of historical understanding that is different from but equally complex as that which seeks to recover the past authentically."
64 Smalley, *English Friars*, 112. See also Allen, *Friar*, 102–10; and Seznec, *Survival*, 168. For more recent considerations of the moralizing classicism of these two authors, see Chance, *Medieval Mythography*, vol. ii. 280–319; and Minnis, *Chaucer*, 20–22.
65 Smalley, *English Friars*, 116.
66 Capgrave may be indebted to Chaucer for this approach to the representation of pagan idols. In a discussion of Chaucer's representation of the pagan past, Minnis reads Chaucer as "not interested in extracting moral truth through the allegorical exposition of the classical gods, heroes and narratives. His concern was with literal truth, with the historical sense … [He] was acutely aware of the essential differences between the pagan past and the Christian present" (*Chaucer*, 21).
67 The iconographical identifications of each god are not far from those of the pagan gods memorialized through *ekphrasis* in Chaucer's "Knight's Tale" and *House of Fame*. Compare, for example, the statues of Venus in "The Knight's Tale," 1.1955–66, and *House of Fame*, lines 131–39, in *Riverside Chaucer*. They also bear some similarities with explications of Christian iconography offered by Pauper in his instructions of Dives. See, for example, Barnum (ed.), *Dives and Pauper*, i. 91–93/4–43.
68 Compare, for example, the anonymous stanzaic *Life of Saint Katherine* in Horstmann (ed.), *Altenglische Legenden*.

69 Augustine, *City of God*, VII.27.
70 On Janus, see especially Augustine, *City of God*, VII.4–5.
71 Katherine debates the Incarnation with the hermit, Adrian, in Book III.
72 Winstead, *John Capgrave's*, 78.
73 For an argument that the "central tension" in the debates is actually "the vivacity of matter," see Stanbury, "Vivacity," 138.
74 On Katherine's simultaneous dismissal and use of her classical learning, see Sarah James, "Doctryne," 279.
75 See, for example, Stanbury, "Vivacity," 145–46, and Sarah James, "Doctryne," 286.
76 Augustine, *City of God*, VI.8.
77 Barnum (ed.), *Dives and Pauper*, I.82/40–41.
78 Winstead, for example, argues this point, suggesting that Capgrave lets the critique rest because it is uncomfortably similar to those made by his own contemporaries. See Capgrave, *Life of St. Katherine*, note to line 1499. Simpson similarly argues that "Katherine concedes this point" (*Reform*, 425).
79 Here again we have a gesture toward Augustine's *City of God*. In arguing against pagan religion, Augustine considers at length the folly of polytheism, of both the multiplicity of gods (a multiplicity, as he points out, that is based on a division of labor) and of the "select gods."
80 Augustine, *City of God*, VII.29.
81 Augustine, *City of God*, VIII.27.
82 Capgrave, *Solace of Pilgrimes*, 1. Henceforth, all citations are to this edition and are cited parenthetically in the text.
83 For a brief comment on the "personal voice" (and its absence) in Capgrave's *Solace*, see Boffey, "Middle English Lives," 615.
84 As Summit, "Topography," 228, has argued, the *Solace* was written, at least in part, "as a way of establishing Rome's historical centrality to Christendom and thus of repairing the damage done to its religious prestige through the crisis of the papal schism."
85 For a brief discussion of *The Solace*'s use of Roman topography as "the focal point for reflection on the meanings and material signs of historical change," see Summit, "Topography," 223–33.
86 Biddick, *Typological Imaginary*.
87 Simpson, *Reform*, 420. See also Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 83; and Summit, "Topography," 229.
88 Gregory the Great, according to Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book I, chapter 30.
89 Weatherly (ed.), *Speculum sacerdotale*, 218–19. Cf. Mirk, *Mirk's Festial*, 266.
90 Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 1.
91 Summit, "Topography," 229.
92 Many of these accounts, as the volume's editor C. A. Mills notes, are drawn from or have analogues in the *Marvels of Rome*.
93 Summit, "Topography," 239.

94 *MED*, "Solas."
95 Cannon, *Grounds*, 33.

5. REGINALD PECOCK'S *LIBRI LAICORUM*

1 W. J. T. Mitchell, *Iconology*, 43.
2 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. I, 213.
3 *Ibid.*, 215.
4 For brief commentary on this passage, see Stanbury, *Visual*, 35.
5 On Pecock's role in London "common-profit book" enterprises, see Scase, "Reginald Pecock," 261.
6 Recent work on Pecock by literary scholars has been overwhelmingly focused on his decision to write theological treatises in the vernacular after the Arundelian Constitutions of 1407 and 1409. For representative studies of Pecock's vernacularity, see Bose, "Reginald Pecock's"; Sarah James, "Revaluing"; and Hardwick, "Breaking."
7 A number of scholars have sought in Pecock a model of either reformist and proto-Protestant tendencies or theological conservatism. Early scholars found in his rationalism and measured apologetics for the church a predecessor to Hooker. For example, see Palmer, *Bad Abbot*, 118; Emerson, "Reginald Pecock," 239; and Ferguson, "Reginald Pecock," 147. Haines defines him as a "tolerant man in an age of intolerance," in "Reginald Pecock." Blackie suggests that "Pecock was at once a product of his own day and the child of a later generation," in "Reginald Pecock," 448. More recently, Simpson has found in Pecock's insistence on a scriptural hermeneutics regulated by human reason a predecessor to Thomas More's later position (*Reform*, 472).
8 Section nine of Arundel's Constitutions addresses image use; see Wilkins (ed.), *Concilia*, III.317–18. For a Lollard response to this section of the Constitutions, see the "Titus Tract" in Hudson (ed.), *Lollard Preacher*, 231–32.
9 As a number of critics have noted, Pecock's response to the Lollards is untimely. He is a latecomer to this debate; by the mid century, most of its other disputants had long ceased their arguments. See Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, 442; and Cole, "Heresy," 433–35.
10 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. I, 274.
11 Pecock's style is still somewhat a matter of debate. Mueller reads Pecock's stylistic project as directly opposing Lollard "Scripturalism," in *Native Tongue*, 139; see also Simpson, "Reginald Pecock." Machan has argued that Pecock was one of the Middle English writers "closest to the Latin tradition and its notions of authorization," in *Textual Criticism*, 112. However, current critical consensus suggests that both Pecock's prose and his interest in circulation of vernacular texts align him much more readily with Lollard generic forms and textual production. See Scase, *Reginald Pecock*, 117; Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, 442; Justice, "Lollardy," 304; Lindenbaum, "London Texts," 298; Bose, "Reginald Pecock's," 219–22; and Patrouch, *Reginald Pecock*, 47–72.

12 The notable exception is Aston's consideration of Pecock in *England's Iconoclasts*, 147–54, and *Lollards*, 117–33.

13 Letter from Thomas Bourchier to the abbot of Thorney Abbey, Oxford Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 789, fol. 326ʳ. Transcribed in Scase, *Reginald Pecock*, 139–40.

14 Oxford, Queen's College, MS 54, fols. 341ᵛ-342ᵛ. Transcribed in Scase, *Reginald Pecock*, 50. For the response to Pecock, also see Catto, "Theology," 275–78. Early scholars predominately found Pecock of interest because of his aberrant theological positions and his distinctiveness as a historical figure. The earliest work on Pecock came in the form of biographies. Lewis' 1744 *Life of the Learned and Right Reverend Reynold Pecock, S. T. P.* was the only full-length biography until Green's monograph in the 1940s. Early twentieth-century biographies include: V. H. H. Green, *Bishop Reginald Pecock*; and Kelly, "Reginald Pecock." The most recent biography, Scase's 1996 contribution to the Authors of the Middle Ages series, gathers related source materials for the study of Pecock which are included in the work's appendices; see Scase, *Reginald Pecock*, 45–66. In addition to biography, synthesis of his theological positions still maintains the privileged line of inquiry in the very small field of "Pecock" studies. Patrouch's *Reginald Pecock* provides an account of the complexities of Pecock's moral system and one of the few analyses of Pecock's style. A more recent reassessment and synthesis of Pecock's theological positions and methodology is Brockwell, *Bishop Reginald Pecock*.

15 Although Pecock's insistence on lay education through increased availability of vernacular devotional books may seem to stand in opposition to the fifteenth-century English church's bans on unauthorized book production and circulation (as Watson suggests, "Censorship," 825), the mid fifteenth century is, in fact, characterized by a flurry of translations of religious texts into English; see Gillespie, "Vernacular Books"; and Catto, "Theology," 273–74.

16 It is difficult to date Pecock's work since he appears to have been working on many of the texts simultaneously and continuing to revise others even after they had begun circulation. The manuscripts are as follows: *The Book of Faith*: Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.14.45; *The Donet*: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 916; *The Folewer to the Donet*: London, British Library, MS Addit. 37788; *The Poore Mennis Myrrour*: London, British Library, MS Royal 17 D.ix; *The Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy*: Cambridge, University Library, MS Kk.4.26; *The Reule of Crysten Religioun*: New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS 519.

17 Scase, *Reginald Pecock*, 102, 108.

18 Pecock, *Folewer*, 29. On Pecock's ventriloquizing of his opponents and the "rhetoricity" of his writings, see Bose, "Reginald Pecock's," 218–19.

19 See, for example, Catto, "Religious"; Watson, "Censorship," and "Conceptions," 90.

20 Hudson sees Pecock's decision to write in the vernacular as a reason for his condemnation ("Laicus," 235). However, as Sarah James has more recently noted, none of the charges against Pecock and none of the extant

accusations from his contemporaries mention any concern that he wrote his
texts in English ("Revaluing," 140–42).

21 See Ball, "Opponents." On Pecock's trial, see also Sarah James, "Revaluing,"
160–62. For recent considerations of the role of reason in Pecock's writing,
see Lahey, "Reginald Pecock"; and Landman, "Doom."

22 For an overview of the role of the "doom of resoun" in Pecock's corpus, see
Lahey, "Reginald Pecock"; and Emerson, "Reginald Pecock's," 235–38.

23 Ghosh, "Bishop Reginald Pecock," 258. For a comparison with Netter, see
Bose, "Reginald Pecock's," 80–87.

24 On the importance of preaching in England after the Council of Constance,
see Gillespie, "Vernacular Theology," 416–17; and Spencer, *English Preaching*,
321–34. Moreover, as Catto points out, after 1430 Oxford examined its grad-
uates on their ability to preach ("Theology," 269).

25 Pecock, *Reule*, 20.

26 Scase, *Reginald Pecock*, 5.

27 Pecock, *Reule*, 9.

28 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 66, 128.

29 *Ibid*., 130.

30 On Lollard hermeneutics, see Ghosh, *Wycliffite Heresy*; and Copeland,
Pedagogy, 99–140.

31 On Pecock's "historicizing" reading of the Bible, see Ferguson, "Reginald
Pecock," 153–57.

32 Pecock, *Folewer*, 7.

33 *Ibid*.

34 Hardwick, to the contrary, reads this passage as demonstrating that "Pecock
clearly defines his own works as being for the benefit of the laity and the
Bible as the domain of the clergy" ("Breaking," 107).

35 Copeland and Woods, "Classroom," 400.

36 Pecock, *Book of Faith*, 250.

37 Alternatively, as Sarah James suggests, the dialogic form serves as a pro-
tective device insofar as the "hypothetical questioner" is able to voice and
explore controversial or unorthodox ideas without aligning the dialogue's
author with these positions ("Revaluing," 148).

38 Pecock, *Folewer*, 8.

39 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 219.

40 Copeland, *Pedagogy*, 99. For another reading of the infantilizing metaphors
in Pecock's writing, see Ghosh, "Bishop Reginald Pecock," 261; and Pecock,
Repressor, vol. 1, 67–68.

41 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 218–19.

42 Pecock, *Reule*, 244–45.

43 Hardwick, "Breaking," 107. For a lengthy consideration of Pecock's position
on images, see Aston, *Lollards*, 117–33.

44 For additional discussion of the relationship of sensory experience and mem-
ory, see Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 221–42. See also Chapter 2, "Thomas
Hoccleve's spectacles," above.

45 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 166.
46 The first of the Lollard critiques of images addressed by Pecock is that "No cause can be assigned whi ymagis schulden be had and vsid and whi pilgrimagis schulden be doon saue this, that bi hem remembraunce and mynde schulde be maad vpon … the benefetis of God, his punyschingis, his holi lijf and passioun … but so it is, that into suche now seid remembrauncis and myndingis to be gendrid and had, and folewingli therbi into ful deuout preiers to be had, mai and wole serue at ful Holi Scripture with othere writingis of Seintis lyues and othere deuoute treticis of blissis in heuen and of peynes in helle and suche othere treticis" (*Repressor*, vol. 1, 191).
47 *Ibid*., 209.
48 *Ibid*.
49 Love, *Mirror*, 10. On Love's representation of "layness," see Karnes, "Nicholas Love," 384–88.
50 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 212.
51 *Ibid*., 212–13. For a brief reading of the role of optical theory in Pecock's writing, see Bose, "Vernacular Philosophy," 88.
52 See Chapter 2 above for a brief discussion of optical discourses.
53 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 214.
54 On vision, bodily "communion," and religious affect, see Biernoff, *Sight*, esp. 133–64.
55 Hoccleve, *Remonstrance*, line 417.
56 Mirk, *Mirk's Festial*, 171.
57 There are, of course, many studies of this visual culture. See, for example, Marks, *Image*; Duffy, *Stripping*; Stanbury, *Visual*; and Brantley, *Reading*.
58 On the proliferation of English murals, see Gill, "Content and Context."
59 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 214.
60 The openness of scriptures is a characteristic formulation of many Lollard writings. For other such catch words, see Anne Hudson, "Lollard Sect Vocabulary," in *Lollards and their Books*, 165–80.
61 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 214.
62 *Ibid*., 213.
63 *Ibid*., 215. For a brief discussion of how processional images might be used in monastic liturgy, see Brantley, *Reading*, 174–78.
64 Duffy, *Stripping*, 137.
65 For an important reading of the sacramental valences of such social texts (focusing on the York drama), see Beckwith, *Signifying*.
66 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 182.
67 *Ibid*., 216.
68 Pecock, *Reule*, 244.
69 The physicality of late medieval spirituality often manifested itself in bequests to the local parish. See Duffy, *Stripping*, 132–35. See also Marks, *Image*, 169–70.
70 On "devotional objects" as "social objects," see Stanbury, *Visual*, 14.

71 On the role of processions in fostering social cohesion, see Duffy, *Stripping*, 136–37.

72 See, for example, the treatise on "Images and Pilgrimages," in Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 83–88. See also Chapter 1 above.

73 Swinburn (ed.), *Lanterne of Liȝt*, 85–87. Similarly, Purvey writes, "Also we graunten that it is leueful and medeful to go on pilgrimage to heuen warde doing werkes of penance, werkis of rigtfulnes, and werkis of mercy … Suche pilgrimage may we wel do without scheching of dede ymages and of schrynes" (quoted in Deanesly, *Lollard Bible*, 166).

74 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 176.

75 *Ibid.*, 235.

76 *Ibid.*, 236.

77 *Ibid.*, 214.

78 "General Prologue," in *Riverside Chaucer*, 1.40.

79 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 238.

80 *Ibid.*, 239.

81 Blackie, "Reginald Pecock," 453.

82 Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 219.

83 Pecock, *Reule*, 404.

84 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 143.

85 *Ibid.*, 145.

86 *Ibid.*, 147.

87 "That ymagis mowe leeffulli be broke, whanne thei ben vsid in ydolatrie irremediabili, for so it was in the caas of the brasen serpent in the tyme of Ezechie … or at the leeste, that ymagis mowe leefulli be brokun, whanne more harme irremediabili cometh bi the hauyng and vsing of hem" (*Ibid.*).

88 *Ibid.*, 158–59.

89 *Ibid.*, 148–49.

90 Von Nolcken (ed.), *Rosarium*, 96.

91 For readings of the "entry," see Bose, "Annunciation," and "Vernacular Philosophy," 82–83.

92 Pecock, *Reule*, 32.

93 *Ibid.*, 33–34.

94 Scase, "Reginald Pecock," 270.

95 Pecock, *Donet*, 2.

96 Pecock, *Reule*, 404.

97 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 76.

98 Simpson, *Reform*, 472. See also Brockwell, *Bishop Reginald Pecock*, 150–51; and Mueller, *Native Tongue*, 140–41.

99 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. 1, 255.

100 *Ibid.*, 255.

101 *Ibid.*, 259.

102 *Ibid.*, 258.

103 *Ibid.*, 261.

104 Pecock, *Reule*, 151.

105 Beckwith, "Sacramentality," 276.
106 Hoccleve, *Remonstrance*, lines 415–16.
107 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. I, 145.
108 Much later in his defense of images, he argues that pagans and Jews did not worship images because they were foolish, but rather because the images were "maad quyke bi pure Goddis descending and aliʒting into hem." He continues, "Hethen men and also Iewis weren neuer so lewid that thei passiden in lewidnes children of x. ʒeer age now lyuyng, or suche persoones whiche in these daies ben clepid and take for foolis" (*Ibid.*, 241).
109 *Ibid.*, 245.
110 See Chapter 4 above.
111 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. I, 248–49.
112 *Ibid.*, 149.
113 Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 87.
114 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. I, 150.
115 Cf. Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 87.
116 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. I, 150–51.
117 On Wyclif's approach to interpreting figurative language, see Ghosh, *Wycliffite Heresy*, 28–35. See also Chapter 1 above.
118 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. I, 252.
119 *Ibid.*, 252–53.
120 *Ibid.*, 253.
121 Cambridge University Library, Dean and Chapter of Peterborough Cathedral, MS 2, fol. 43^{r-v}. Transcribed in Scase, *Reginald Pecock*, 46–48.
122 Scase, *Reginald Pecock*, 31.
123 For a consideration of the links drawn between heresy and literacy in Europe generally in the late Middle Ages, see Biller and Hudson (eds.), *Heresy and Literacy*.
124 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. I, 85–86.
125 Simpson, *Reform*, 476.
126 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. I, 86.
127 *Ibid.*
128 Hughes, *Pastors*, 2. See also Watson, "Censorship," 824 ff.
129 As Aston suggests, in the fifteenth century, "the widespread dissemination of writings and the developing abilities of all sorts of people, peasants upward, to deal with them, may be regarded … in the light of a challenge to ecclesiastical traditions" (*Lollards*, 105).
130 See also Strohm, *Politique*, 155.
131 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. I, 273–74.
132 Simpson, *Reform*, 388. On this topic, see also Cummings, "Iconoclasm."
133 Pecock, *Repressor*, vol. I, 274.
134 *Ibid.*, 274.
135 *Ibid.*, 216.
136 Scase, "Reginald Pecock," 260.

137 *Ibid.*, 261.
138 Interestingly, many of them, such as Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.6.31, contain written materials that arguably demonstrate Lollard sympathies.
139 Pecock, *Book of Faith*, 116.
140 On Lollard book circulation and reading practices, see Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, 206.
141 Copeland, "Childhood," 149.
142 Hudson (ed.), *Selections*, 96.
143 Pecock, *Donet*, 226.
144 Mitchell, *Iconology*, 43.

<div style="text-align:center">EPILOGUE: WORDS FOR IMAGES</div>

1 "quod si ymago beate Marie de Turre civitatis predicte posita esset ad ignem, faceret bonum ignem." For both the Latin texts and English translations of these trial records, see McSheffrey and Tanner (eds.), *Lollards*, 65.
2 *Ibid.*, 71.
3 "Item, quod peregrinare ad ymagines beate Marie de Dancastrie, Walsyngham vel de Turre civitatis Coventr fatuum esset, quia ita bene posset quis venerari beatam Virginum iuxta ignem in coquina sicut in locis predictis, et ita bene posset quis venerari beatam Virginem videndo matrem vel sororem sicut visitando ymagines, quia sunt tantomodo ligna mortua et lapides" (*ibid.*, 64).
4 Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 158.
5 On the Marian altarpiece, see Gillespie, "Medieval Hypertext," 206–29.
6 More, *Complete Works*, 1.355–59.
7 Latimer, *Sermons*, 233.
8 For a short discussion of the sixteenth-century printing of *Dives and Pauper*, see Nichols, "Books-for-Laymen," 464.
9 Frere and Kennedy (eds.), *Visitation Articles*, vol. II, 320.
10 For discussion of the Injunctions' positions on images, see Simpson, *Reform*, 383–85.
11 Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 347.
12 For an excellent essay on this systematic replacement of images with text, see Cummings, "Iconoclasm."
13 See, for example, Dyrness, *Reformed Theology*; and Eire, *War*. Even Margaret Aston's magisterial treatment of the topic, *England's Iconoclasts*, moves rapidly from the Wycliffite critiques to Reformation debates in the 1520s, with only a brief discussion of fifteenth-century responses that focuses largely on Pecock.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

Andrew, Malcom, Ronald Waldron, and Clifford Peterson (eds.). *The Complete Works of the Pearl Poet,* trans. Casey Finch. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Scriptum super libros sententiarum*, ed. P. Mandonnet and M. F. Moos. Paris, 1929–47.

   Summa theologica. Blackfriars edition (Latin and English). 61 vols. New York: McGraw Hill, 1964–81.

Augustine. *On Christian Doctrine,* trans. D. W. Robertson. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1958.

   The City of God, trans. Henry Bettenson. New York: Penguin, 1972.

Barnum, P. H. (ed.). *Dives and Pauper.* EETS o.s. 275, 280. London: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Barr, Helen (ed.). *The Piers Plowman Tradition.* London: J. M. Dent, 1993.

Bede. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People,* ed. J. M. Wallace-Hadrill. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Bernard of Clairvaux. *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, ed. J. Leclercq and H. Rochais. 7 vols. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957–74.

Biblia Sacra Vulgata, ed. Robert Weber, with B. Fischer, J. Gribomont, H. F. D. Sparks, and W. Thiele. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969; 4th edn, rev. R. Gryson, 1994.

Bokenham, Osbern. *Legendys of Hooly Wummen,* ed. Mary S. Serjeantson. EETS o.s. 206. London: Oxford University Press, 1938; repr. 1971.

Brown, Carleton (ed.). *Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.

   Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

Capgrave, John. *Ye Solace of Pilgrimes: A Description of Rome, circa A.D. 1450*, ed. C. A. Milles. London: Oxford University Press, 1911.

   The Life of Saint Norbert, ed. Cyril Lawrence Smetana, O.S.A. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1977.

   Abbreuiacion of Chronicles, ed. Peter J. Lucas. EETS o.s. 285. Oxford University Press, 1983.

The Life of Saint Katherine, ed. Karen Winstead. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1999.

Chance, Jane (ed). *The Assembly of Gods.* Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1999.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Riverside Chaucer,* ed. Larry Benson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Cigman, Gloria (ed.). *Lollard Sermons.* EETS o.s. 294. Oxford University Press, 1989.

Comper, Frances M. M. (ed.). *The Book of the Craft of Dying and other Early English Tracts Concerning Death.* New York: Arno Press, 1977.

Compston, H. F. B. (ed.). "The Thirty-Seven Conclusions of the Lollards." *The English Historical Review* 26 (1911): 738–49.

Cronin, H. S. (ed.). "The Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards." *The English Historical Review* 22 (1907): 292–304.

Dean, James M. (ed.). *Six Ecclesiastical Satires.* Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1991.

D'Evelyn, Charlotte (ed.). *Meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ.* EETS o.s. 158. London: Oxford University Press, 1921; repr. 1987.

Durand, Guillaume. *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, ed. A. Davril and T. M. Thibodeau. Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 140–140B. Turnhout: Brepols, 1995.

Dymmok, Rogeri. *Liber contra xii errores et hereses lollardorum,* ed. H. S. Cronin. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., for the Wyclif Society, 1921, 1922.

Forshall, Josiah, and Frederic Madden (eds.). *The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal Books, in the earliest English versions made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his followers.* 4 vols. Oxford University Press, 1850; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1982.

Frere, W. H., and W. McClure Kennedy (eds.). *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation.* 3 vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1910.

Furnivall, F. J. (ed.). *Hymns to the Virgin and Christ: The Parliament of Devils and other Religious Poems.* EETS o.s. 24. London: N. Trübner & Co., 1867; repr. New York: Greenwood Press, 1969.

Geoffrey of Vinsauf. *Poetria Nova of Geoffrey of Vinsauf,* trans. Margaret F. Nims. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1967.

Gerson, Jean. *Œuvres complètes*, ed. P. Glorieux. 10 vols. Paris: Desclée, 1960–73.

Gibbs, Henry Hucks (ed.). *The Life and Martyrdom of St. Katherine of Alexandria.* London: Nichols, 1884.

Gower, John. *Confessio Amantis*, in *The Complete Works of John Gower,* ed. G. C. Macaulay. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899–1902.

Grassus, Benvenutus. *The Wonderful Art of the Eye: A Critical Edition of the Middle English Translation of his De probatissima arte oculorum,* ed. L. M. Eldredge. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1996.

Gregory the Great. *Selected Epistles of Gregory the Great*, trans. J. Barmby. Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd ser., 13. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, repr. 1976.

Registrum Epistularum, ed. Dag Norberg. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 140–140A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1982.

Herebert, William. *The Works of William Herebert, OFM*, ed. Stephen R. Reimer. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1987.

Heyworth, P. L. (ed.). *Jack Upland, Friar Daw's Reply, and Upland's Rejoinder.* Oxford University Press, 1968.

Hilton, Walter. *Walter Hilton's Latin Writings*, ed. John P. H. Clark and Cheryl Taylor. 2 vols. Salzburg: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 1987.

The Scale of Perfection, ed. Thomas H. Bestul. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2000.

Hoccleve, Thomas. *Hoccleve's Works: The Minor Poems,* ed. Frederick Furnivall and Israel Gollancz. EETS e.s. 61, 73. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1892, 1925; rev. Jerome Mitchell and A. I. Doyle, 1970.

The Regiment of Princes, ed. Charles R. Blyth. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1999.

Thomas Hoccleve's Complaint and Dialogue, ed. J. A. Burrow. EETS o.s. 313. Oxford University Press, 1999.

Hodgson, Phyllis (ed.). *The Cloud of Unknowing and Other Treatises*. Analecta Cartusiana 3. Salzburg: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Universitat Salzburg, 1982.

Hogg, James (ed.). "An Illustrated Yorkshire Carthusian Religious Miscellany, British Library London Additional MS. 37049." *Analecta Cartusiana* 95:3 (1981).

The Holy Bible: Douay-Rheims Version. Baltimore, 1899; repr. Rockford, IL: TAN Books, 2000.

Horstmann, Carl (ed.). *Altenglische Legenden: neue Folge.* Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1881; repr. 1969.

Hudson, Anne (ed.). *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings*. Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Two Wycliffite Texts: The Sermon of William Taylor 1406, the Testimony of William Thorpe 1407. EETS o.s. 301. Oxford University Press, 1993.

The Works of a Lollard Preacher. EETS o.s. 317. Oxford University Press, 2001.

Isidore of Seville. *Etymologiae*, ed. W. M. Lindsay. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911; repr. 1985.

John of Damascus. *Three Treatises on the Divine Images,* trans. Andrew Louth. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003.

Julian of Norwich. *A Book of Showings to the Anchoress Julian of Norwich*, ed. Edmund Colledge and James Walsh. 2 vols. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1978.

Kempe, Margery. *The Book of Margery Kempe*, ed. Stanford Brown Meech and Emily Hope Allen. EETS o.s. 212. London: Oxford University Press, 1940.

Knighton, Henry. *Knighton's Chronicle, 1337–1396*, ed. and trans. G. H. Martin. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Langland, William. *Piers Plowman: A Critical Edition of the B-Text*, ed. A. V. C. Schmidt. 2nd edn. London: J. M. Dent, 1995.

Latimer, Hugh. *Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer,* ed. George Elwes Corrie. Cambridge, 1845.

Love, Nicholas. *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*, ed. Michael Sargent. New York: Garland Press, 1992.

Lydgate, John. *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man,* ed. F. J. Furnivall and Katharine Locock. EETS e.s. 77, 83, and 92. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1899, 1901, 1904.

    Lydgate's Troy Book, ed. Henry Bergen. EETS e.s. 97, 103, 106, 126. London: Kegan, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1906; repr. 1981.

    The Dance of Death, ed. Florence Warren. EETS o.s. 181. London: Oxford University Press, 1931.

    The Minor Poems of John Lydgate I, ed. Henry Noble MacCracken. EETS e.s. 107. London: Oxford University Press, 1911.

    The Life of Saint Alban and Saint Amphibal, ed. J. E. Van Der Westhuizen. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

Manzalaoui, M. A. (ed.). *Secretum secretorum: Nine English Versions*. EETS o.s. 276. Oxford University Press, 1977.

McSheffrey, Shannon, and Norman Tanner (eds. and trans.). *Lollards of Coventry, 1486–1522.* Camden Fifth Series 23. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Milton, John. *John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose*, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1957.

Mirk, John. *Mirk's Festial: A Collection of Homilies*, ed. Theodor Erbe. EETS e.s. 96. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1905.

More, Thomas. *Complete Works*, vol. 6. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.

Netter, Thomas. *Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei catholicae ecclesiae,* ed. B. Bianciotti. 3 vols. Venice, 1757–59.

Pecock, Reginald. *Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy*, ed. Churchill Babington. 2 vols. Rolls Series 19. London: HMSO, 1860; repr. 1966.

    The Book of Faith, ed. J. L. Morison. Glasgow, 1909.

    The Donet, ed. Elsie Vaughan Hitchcock. EETS o.s. 156. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.

    The Folewer to the Donet, ed. Elsie Vaughan Hitchcock. EETS o.s. 164. London: Oxford University Press, 1924.

    The Reule of Crysten Religioun, ed. William Cabell Greet. EETS o.s. 171. London: Oxford University Press, 1927.

Petrarca (Petrarch), Francesco. *Letters from Petrarch,* selected and trans. Morris Bishop. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.

Ridewall, John. *Fulgentius metaforalis, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Mythologie im Mittelalter,* ed. Hans Liebeschütz. Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 4. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1926.

Robbins, Rossell Hope (ed.). *Historical Poems of the XIVth and XVth Centuries.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Shirley, Walter Waddington (ed.). *Fasciculi zizaniorum magistri Johannis Wyclif cum tritico.* London: Krause Reprint, 1965.

Somerset, Fiona (ed.). *Four English Wycliffite Dialogues.* EETS o.s. 333. Oxford University Press, 2009.

Swinburn, Lillian (ed.). *The Lanterne of Liȝt.* EETS o.s. 151. London: Kegan Paul, Oxford University Press, 1917.

Tanner, Norman P. (ed.). *Heresy Trials in the Diocese of Norwich, 1428–31.* Camden Fourth Series 20. London: Royal Historical Society, 1977.

Tertullian. *Apology, De spectaculis,* trans. T. R. Glover. Loeb Classical Library 250. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.

Theophilus. *De Diuersis Artibus,* ed. and trans. C. R. Dodwell. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961.

Verminghoff, A. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Leges* 3. Concilia 2.2. Hanover, 1908.

von Nolcken, Christina (ed.). *The Middle English Translation of the Rosarium Theologie: A Selection ed. from Cbr., Gonville and Caius Coll. MS 354/581.* Middle English Texts 10. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1979.

Walsingham, Thomas. *Chronicon Angliae,* ed. E. M. Thompson. Rolls Series 64: London: Longman, 1874.

Weatherly, Edward H. (ed.). *Speculum sacerdotale,* EETS o.s. 200. London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1936.

Wilkins, D. (ed.). *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae.* 4 vols. London: 1737.

Wyclif, John. *The English Works of John Wyclif, hitherto unprinted,* ed. F. D. Matthew. EETS o.s. 74. New York: Krause Reprint, 1978.

    Tractatus de Mandatis Divinis, ed. J. Loserth and F. D. Matthew. London: Wyclif Society, 1922.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adams, Marilyn McCord. "Intuitive Cognition, Certainty, and Scepticism in William Ockham." *Traditio* 26 (1970): 389–98.

Aers, David, and Lynn Staley. *Powers of the Holy: Religion, Politics, and Gender in Late Medieval English Culture.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.

Akbari, Suzanne. *Seeing through the Veil: Optical Theory and Medieval Allegory.* University of Toronto Press, 2004.

Allen, Judson Boyce. *The Friar as Critic.* Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1971.

Appleford, Amy. "The Dance of Death in London: John Carpenter, John Lydgate, and the *Daunce of the Poulys.*" *JMEMS* 38:2 (2008): 285–314.

Aston, Margaret. *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion*. London: Hambledon Press, 1984.

    England's Iconoclasts: Laws Against Images, vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Ball, R. M. "The Opponents of Bishop Pecock." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 48 (1997): 230–62.

Barasch, Moshe. *Icon: Studies in the History of an Idea.* New York University Press, 1992.

Barr, Helen. *Signes and Sothe: Language in the Piers Plowman Tradition.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1994.

    "Wycliffite Representations of the Third Estate," in *Lollards and Their Influence in Late Medieval England,* ed. Fiona Somerset, Jill C. Havens, and Derrick G. Pitard, 197–216. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.

Beckwith, Sarah. *Christ's Body: Identity, Culture, and Society in Late Medieval Writings*. London: Routledge, 1993.

    "Sacrum Signum: Sacramentality and Dissent in York's Theater of Corpus Christi," in *Criticism and Dissent in the Middle Ages*, ed. Rita Copeland, 264–88. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

    Signifying God: Social Relation and Symbolic Act in the York Corpus Christi Plays. University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Beer, Jeanette. *Narrative Conventions of Truth in the Middle Ages*. Études de Philologie et d'Histoire 38. Genève: Librairie Droz, 1981.

Belting, Hans. *The Image and Its Public in the Middle Ages: Form and Function of Early Paintings of the Passion*, trans. M. Bartusis and R. Meyer. New Rochelle, NY: Caratzas, 1990.

    Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art, trans. Edmund Jephcott. University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Bennett, H. S. *Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Bennett, Jill. "Stigmata and Sense Memory: St. Francis and the Affective Image." *Art History* 24 (2001): 1–16.

Bertelli, Carlo. "The Image of Pity in Santa Croce in Gerusalemme," in *Essays in the History of Art Presented to Rudolf Wittkower*, ed. Douglas Fraser, Howard Hibbard, and Milton J. Lewine, 40–55. London: Phaidon, 1967.

Biddick, Kathleen. *The Typological Imaginary: Circumcision, Technology, History*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.

Biernoff, Suzannah. *Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Biller, Peter, and Anne Hudson (eds.). *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530.* Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Blackie, E. M. "Reginald Pecock." *The English Historical Review* 26 (1911): 448–68.

Boffey, Julia. "Lydgate, Henryson, and the Literary Testament." *Modern Language Quarterly* 53 (1992): 41–56.

    "Middle English Lives," in Wallace (ed.), 610–36.

Bond, Francis. *Dedications & Patron Saints of English Churches: Ecclesiastical Symbolism, Saints and their Emblems.* Oxford University Press, 1914.

Bose, Mishtooni. "The Annunciation to Pecock." *Notes and Queries* 47 (2000): 172–76.

"Reginald Pecock's Vernacular Voice," in *Lollards and their Influence in Late Medieval England*, ed. Fiona Somerset, Jill Havens, and Derrick G. Pitard, 217–36. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.

"Vernacular Philosophy and the Making of Orthodoxy." *New Medieval Literatures* 7 (2005): 73–99.

Bowers, John. "Thomas Hoccleve and the Politics of Tradition." *The Chaucer Review* 36 (2002): 352–69.

Bowers, R. H. "Middle English Verses on the Appearance of Christ." *Anglia* 70 (1951): 430–33.

Brantley, Jessica. *Reading in the Wilderness: Private Devotion and Public Performance in Late Medieval England.* University of Chicago Press, 2007.

"Vision, Image, Text," in Strohm (ed.), 315–34.

Brockwell, Charles. *Bishop Reginald Pecock and the Lancastrian Church: Securing the Foundations of Cultural Authority.* Lewiston, ME: Edwin Mellen Press, 1985.

Brown, Peter. "Images," in *A Companion to Medieval English Literature and Culture c. 1350–c.1500,* ed. Peter Brown, 307–21. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.

Bryan, Jennifer. "Hoccleve, the Virgin, and the Politics of Complaint." *PMLA* 117 (2002): 1172–87.

Looking Inward: Devotional Reading and the Private Self in Late Medieval England. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Burrow, John. "The Poet as Petitioner." *SAC* 3 (1981): 61–75.

"Autobiographical Poetry in the Middle Ages: The Case of Thomas Hoccleve." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 68 (1982): 389–412.

"Hoccleve's *Series*: Experience and Books," in *Fifteenth-Century Studies: Recent Essays*, ed. Robert F. Yeager, 259–73. Hamden: Archon Books, 1984.

Thomas Hoccleve. Authors of the Middle Ages 4. Aldershot: Variorum, 1994.

"Hoccleve's *Complaint* and Isidore of Seville Again." *Speculum* 73 (1998): 424–28.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Callus, D. A. "Robert Grosseteste as Scholar," in *Robert Grosseteste, Scholar and Bishop: Essays in Commemoration of the Seventh Centenary of his Death*, ed. D. A. Callus, 1–69. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Camille, Michael. "Seeing and Reading: Some Visual Implications of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy." *Art History* 8 (1985): 26–49.

The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image Making in Medieval Art. Cambridge University Press, 1989.

"The Iconoclast's Desire: Deguileville's Idolatry in France and England," in Dimmick *et al.* (eds.), 151–71.

Cannon, Christopher. *The Grounds of English Literature.* Oxford University Press, 2004.
  "Form," in Strohm (ed.), 177–90.
Carruthers, Mary. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture.* Cambridge University Press, 1990.
  The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400–1200. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
Catto, J. "Religious Change under Henry V," in *Henry V: The Practice of Kingship*, ed. G. L. Harriss, 97–115. Oxford University Press, 1985.
  "Theology after Wycliffism," in *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 2, ed. Jeremy Catto and Ralph Evans. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
de Certeau, Michel. *The Writing of History,* trans. Tom Conley. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
Chambers, E. K. *English Literature at the Close of the Middle Ages.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1945.
Chance, Jane. *Medieval Mythography.* 2 vols. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1994.
Chazelle, Celia. "Matter, Spirit, and Image in the Libri Carolini." *Recherches Augustiniennes* 21 (1986): 163–84.
Cigman, Gloria. "Luceat Lux Vestra: The Lollard Preacher as Truth and Light." *The Review of English Studies,* n.s. 40 (1989): 479–96.
Clanchy, M. *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066–1307.* 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
Clark, J. P. H. "Walter Hilton in Defense of the Religious Life and the Veneration of Images." *Downside Review* 103 (1985): 1–25.
Clayton, Mary. *The Cult of the Virgin in Anglo-Saxon England.* Cambridge University Press, 1990.
Cole, Andrew. "Heresy and Humanism," in Strohm (ed.), 421–37.
  Literature and Heresy in the Age of Chaucer. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
Cooke, John Daniel. "Euhemerism: A Medieval Interpretation of Classical Paganism." *Speculum* 2 (1927): 396–410.
Cooper, Lisa H. "'Markys … of the Workman': Heresy, Hagiography, and the Heavens in *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*," in *Lydgate Matters: Poetry and Material Culture in the Fifteenth Century,* ed. Lisa H. Cooper and Andrea Denny-Brown, 89–111. New York: Palgrave, 2008.
Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages.* Cambridge University Press, 1991.
  "Childhood, Pedagogy, and the Literal Sense: From Late Antiquity to the Lollard Heretical Classroom." *New Medieval Literatures* 1 (1997): 125–56.
  Pedagogy, Intellectuals, and Dissent in the Later Middle Ages: Lollardy and Ideas of Learning. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
Copeland, Rita and Majorie Curry Woods. "Classroom and Confession," in Wallace (ed.), 376–406.

Cornell, Christine. "'Purtreture' and 'Holsom Stories': Lydgate's Accommodation of Image and Text in Three Religious Lyrics." *Florilegium* 10 (1988–91): 167–78.

Coulton, G. G. *Art and the Reformation.* 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Crombie, A. C. *Robert Grosseteste and the Origins of Experimental Science, 1100–1700.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

   Science, Art, and Nature in Medieval and Modern Thought. Oxford: Hambledon Press, 1996.

Cummings, Brian. "Iconoclasm and Bibliophilia in the English Reformation, 1521–1558," in Dimmick *et al.* (eds.), 185–205.

Deanesly, Margaret. *The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions.* Cambridge University Press, 1920; repr. 1966.

Denery, Dallas G. *Seeing and Being Seen in the Later Medieval World: Optics, Theology, and Religious Life.* Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Dimmick, Jeremy, James Simpson, and Nicolette Zeeman (eds.). *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm in Late Medieval England: Textuality and the Visual Image.* Oxford University Press, 2002.

Dinshaw, Carolyn. "Temporalities," in Strohm (ed.), 107–23.

Doyle, A. I. "An Unrecognized Piece of *Piers the Ploughman's Creed* and other Work by its Scribe." *Speculum* 34 (1959): 428–36.

Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400–1580.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Duggan, Lawrence G. "Was Art Really the 'Book of the Illiterate'?" *Word and Image* 5 (1989): 227–51.

Dyrness, William A. *Reformed Theology and Visual Culture: The Protestant Imagination from Calvin to Edwards.* Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Eastwood, Bruce. "Mediaeval Empiricism: The Case of Grosseteste's Optics." *Speculum* 43 (1968): 306–21.

Ebin, Lois. *Illuminator, Makar, Vates: Visions of Poetry in the Fifteenth Century.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1988.

Eco, Umberto. *Art and Beauty in the Middle Ages.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

   The Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas, trans. Hugh Breden. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Edwards, A. S. G. "Lydgate Scholarship: Progress and Prospectus." In *Fifteenth-Century Studies: Recent Essays*, ed. Robert F. Yeager, 29–47. Handen: Archon Books, 1984.

   "Review of Lollard Sermons." *Speculum* 67 (1992): 124–26.

   (ed.). *A Companion to Middle English Prose.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2004.

Eire, Carlos. *War Against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin.* Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Emerson, Everett. "Reginald Pecock: Christian Rationalist." *Speculum* 31 (1956): 235–42.

Endres, J. A. "Die Darstellung der Gregorius-Messe im Mittelalter." *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst* 30 (1917): 146–56.

Ferguson, Arthur. "Reginald Pecock and the Renaissance Sense of History." *Studies in the Renaissance* 13 (1966): 147–65.

Floyd, Jennifer. "St. George and the 'Steyned Halle': Lydgate's Verse for the London Armourers," in *Lydgate Matters: Poetry and Material Culture in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Lisa H. Cooper and Andrea Denny-Brown, 139–64. New York: Palgrave, 2008.

Ford, Judy Ann. *John Mirk's* Festial: *Orthodoxy, Lollardy, and the Common People in Fourteenth-Century England*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2006.

Fradenburg, Aranye. "Making, Mourning and the Love of Idols," in Dimmick *et al.* (eds.), 25–42.

Frankis, John. "Review of *Lollard Sermons*." *The Review of English Studies* 42 (1991): 437–38.

Freeman, Michael, and Andrew D. E. Lewis (eds.), *Law and Literature*. Oxford University Press, 1999.

Frugoni, Chiara. *Books, Banks, Buttons and Other Inventions from the Middle Ages,* trans. William McCuaig. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Fulton, Rachel. *From Judgment to Passion: Devotion to Christ and the Virgin Mary, 800–1200*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Gaffney, Wilbur. "The Allegory of the Christ-Knight in *Piers Plowman*." *PMLA* 46 (1931): 155–68.

Galloway, Andrew. "Writing History in England," in Wallace (ed.), 255–83.

Gayk, Shannon. "'As Plouȝmen han preued': The Alliterative Work of a Set of Lollard Sermons." *YLS* 20 (2006): 43–65.

   "Lollard Writings, Literary Criticism, and the Meaningfulness of Form," in *Lollard Controversies*, ed. Mishtooni Bose and J. Patrick Hornbeck. Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming 2011.

Gero, Stephen. "The *Libri Carolini* and the Image Controversy." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 17 (1973): 7–34.

Ghosh, Kantik. *The Wycliffite Heresy: Authority and the Interpretation of Texts*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

   "Bishop Reginald Pecock and the Idea of 'Lollardy'," in *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honor of Anne Hudson,* ed. Helen Barr and Ann M. Hutchison, 251–65. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.

Giancarlo, Matthew. "Speculative Genealogies," in Strohm (ed.), 352–68.

Gibson, Gail. *Theater of Devotion: East Anglian Drama and Society in the Late Middle Ages*. University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Gill, Miriam. "The Role of Images in Monastic Education: The Evidence from Wall Painting in Late Medieval England," in *Medieval Monastic Education*, ed. George Ferzoco and Carolyn Muessig, 117–35. London: Leicester University Press, 2000.

   "Late Medieval Wall-Painting in England: Content and Context (c. 1330–c. 1530)." Unpublished PhD thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, 2001.

"Preaching and Image: Sermons and Wall Paintings in Later Medieval England," in *Preacher, Sermon, and Audience in the Middle Ages*, ed. Carolyn Muessig, 155–80. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

"Reading Images: Church Murals and Collaboration between Media in Medieval England," in *Collaboration in the Arts from the Middle Ages to the Present,* ed. Silvia Bigliazzi and Sharon Wood, 17–32. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Gillespie, Vincent. "Vernacular Books of Religion," in *Book Production and Publishing in Britain, 1375–1475,* ed. Jeremy Griffiths and Derek Pearsall, 317–44. Cambridge University Press, 1989.

"Images and Idols: Pastoral Adaptations of *The Scale of Perfection*," in *Langland, The Mystics, and the Medieval Religious Tradition: Essays in Honour of S. S. Hussey*, ed. Helen Phillips, 97–123. Cambridge, D. S. Brewer, 1990.

"Medieval Hypertext: Image and Text from York Minster," in *Of the Making of Books: Medieval Manuscripts, their Scribes and Readers: Essays presented to M. B. Parkes*, ed. P. R. Robinson and Rivkah Zim, 206–29. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997.

"Vernacular Theology," in Strohm (ed.), 401–20.

Gray, Douglas. *Themes and Images in the Medieval English Religious Lyric.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.

Green, Richard Firth. *A Crisis of Truth: Literature and Law in Medieval England.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.

"Medieval Law and Literature," in Wallace (ed.), 407–31.

Green, V. H. H. *Bishop Reginald Pecock: A Study in Ecclesiastical History and Thought*. Cambridge University Press, 1945.

Greene, Thomas. *Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.

Hagen, Susan K. *Allegorical Remembrance: A Study of* The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man *as a Treatise on Seeing and Remembering*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990.

Haines, R. M. "Reginald Pecock: A Tolerant Man in an Age of Intolerance." *Studies in Church History* 21 (1984): 125–37.

Hamburger, Jeffrey. "The Visual and the Visionary: The Image in Late Medieval Monastic Devotions." *Viator* 20 (1989): 161–82.

The Visual and the Visionary: Art and Female Spirituality in Late Medieval Germany. New York: Zone Books, 1998.

Hammond, Eleanor. "Two Tapestry Poems by Lydgate: The Life of St. George and the Falls of Seven Princes." *Englische Studien* 43 (1910): 10–26.

English Verse Between Chaucer and Surrey. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1927.

Hardwick, Paul. "Breaking the Rules that 'ben not writen': Reginald Pecock and the Vernacular." *Parergon* 19 (2002): 101–18.

Hasler, Anthony. "Hoccleve's Unregimented Body." *Paragraph* 13 (1990): 164–83.

Havens, Jill C. "Shading the Grey Area: Determining Heresy in Middle English Texts," in *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honor of Anne*

Hudson, ed. Helen Barr and Ann M. Hutchison, 337–52. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.

Heffernan, Thomas J. *Sacred Biography: Saints and their Biographers in the Middle Ages.* Oxford University Press, 1988.

Hiatt, Alfred. "Historical Writing," in Edwards (ed.), 171–94.

Hilmo, Maidie. *Medieval Images, Icons and Illustrated English Literary Texts: From the Ruthwell Cross to the Ellesmere Chaucer.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Holsinger, Bruce. "Lollard Ekphrasis: Situated Aesthetics and Literary History." *JMEMS* 35:1 (2005): 67–89.

Hornbeck, J. Patrick II. "Lollard Sermons?: Soteriology and Late-Medieval Dissent." *Notes and Queries* 53 (2006): 27–30.

"The Development of Heresy: Doctrinal Variation in English 'Lollard' Dissent, 1381–1521." Unpublished PhD thesis, Oxford University, 2007.

Hudson, Anne. *Lollards and their Books.* London: Hambledon Press, 1983.

"Epilogue: The Legacy of *Piers Plowman*," in *A Companion to Piers Plowman,* ed. John Alford, 251–66. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

"Laicus litteratus: The Paradox of Lollardy," in *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530,* ed. Peter Biller and Anne Hudson, 222–36. Cambridge University Press, 1994.

"Palmer, Thomas (*fl.* 1371–1415)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition, Jan. 2008, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21216.

Hughes, Jonathan. *Pastors and Visionaries: Religion and Secular Life in Late Medieval Yorkshire.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1988.

James, M. R. "Pictor in Carmine." *Archaeologia* 94 (1951): 141–66.

James, R. Rutson. *Studies in the History of Ophthalmology in England Prior to the Year 1800.* Cambridge University Press, 1933.

James, Sarah. "Revaluing Theology: The Case of Reginald Pecock." *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 33 (2002): 135–64.

"'Doctryne and studie': Female Learning and Religious Debate in Capgrave's *Life of Saint Katherine.*" *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 36 (2005): 275–302.

Jones, W. R. "Lollards and Images: The Defense of Religious Art in Later Medieval England." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 34 (1973): 27–50.

Justice, Steven. "Lollardy," in Wallace (ed.), 662–89.

Kallendorf, Craig. "From Virgil to Vida: The *Poeta Theologus* in Italian Renaissance Commentary." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56:1 (1995): 41–62.

Kamerick, Kathleen. *Popular Piety and Art in the Late Middle Ages: Image Worship and Idolatry in England, 1350–1500.* Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.

Karnes, Michelle. "Nicholas Love and Medieval Meditations on Christ." *Speculum* 82 (2007): 380–408.

Keen, Jill Averil. *The Charters of Christ and Piers Plowman.* New York: Peter Lang, 2002.

Kelly, Thomas. "Reginald Pecock: A Contribution to his Biography." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Manchester, 1945.

Kerby-Fulton, Katherine. *Books Under Suspicion: Censorship and Tolerance of Revelatory Writing in Late Medieval England.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.

and Denise Despres. *Iconography and the Professional Reader: The Politics of Book Production in the Douce Piers Plowman.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Kimmelman, Burt. "Ockham, Chaucer, and the Emergence of Modern Poetics," in *The Rhetorical Poetics of the Middle Ages: Reconstructive Polyphony*, ed. John M. Hill and Deborah M. Sinnreich-Levi, 177–205. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 2000.

Knapp, Ethan. *The Bureaucratic Muse: Thomas Hoccleve and the Literature of Late Medieval England.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001.

"Poetic Work and Scribal Labor in Hoccleve and Langland," in *The Middle Ages at Work,* ed. Kellie Robertson and Michael Uebel, 210–28. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Kolve, V. A. *The Play Called Corpus Christi.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Kurtz, Benjamin. "The Source of Occleve's Lerne to Dye." *Modern Language Notes* 38 (1923): 337–40.

"The Prose of Occleve's Lerne to Dye." *Modern Language Notes* 39 (1924): 56–57.

"The Relation of Occleve's Lerne to Dye to its Source." *PMLA* 40 (1925): 252–75.

Lahey, Stephen. "Reginald Pecock on the Authority of Reason, Scripture, and Tradition." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56 (2005): 235–60.

Lampen, Willibrordus. "'Pie Pelicane, Iesu Domine.'" *Antonianum* 12 (1946): 68–92.

Landman, James H. "'The Doom of Resoun': Accommodating Lay Interpretation in Late Medieval England," in *Medieval Crime and Social Control,* ed. Barbara Hanawalt and David Wallace, 90–123. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Lauritis, Joseph A., Ralph A. Klinefelter, and Vernon F. Gallagher (eds.). *A Critical Edition of John Lydgate's Life of Our Lady.* Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1961.

Lawes, Richard. "Psychological Disorder and the Autobiographical Impulse in Julian of Norwich, Margery Kempe and Thomas Hoccleve," in *Writing Religious Women: Female Spiritual and Textual Practices in Late Medieval England*, ed. Denis Renevey and Christiania Whitehead, 217–44. University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Lawton, David. "Lollardy and the 'Piers Plowman' Tradition." *Modern Language Review* 76 (1981): 780–93.

"Dullness and the Fifteenth Century." *English Literary History* 54 (1987): 761–99.

Leclercq, Jean. *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God,* trans. Catharine Misrahi. New York: Fordham University Press, 1961.

Lerer, Seth. *Chaucer and his Readers: Imagining the Author in Late Medieval England.* Princeton University Press, 1993.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. *Laocoon: An Essay upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry,* trans. Ellen Frothingham. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1969.

LeVert, Laurelle. "'Crucifye hem, Crucifye hem': The Subject and Affective Response in Middle English Passion Narratives." *Essays in Medieval Studies* 14 (1997): 73–90.

Levertov, Denise. "Origins of a Poem," in *Claims for Poetry*, ed. Donald Hall. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1982.

Lewis, Katherine J. *The Cult of St Katherine of Alexandria in Late Medieval England.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000.

  "History, Historiography, and Re-writing the Past," in *A Companion to Middle English Hagiography,* ed. Sarah Salih, 122–40. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2006.

Lindberg, David. *Theories of Vision from Al-Kindi to Kepler.* University of Chicago Press, 1976.

  "Lines of Influence in Thirteenth-Century Optics: Bacon, Witelo, and Pecham." *Speculum* 46 (1971): 66–83.

Lindenbaum, Sheila. "London Texts and Literate Practice," in Wallace (ed.), 284–309.

Little, Katherine C. *Confession and Resistance: Defining the Self in Late Medieval England.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.

  "Images, Texts, and Exegetics in Chaucer's Second Nun's Tale." *JMEMS* 36:1 (2006): 103–34.

Lovatt, Roger. "Henry Suso and the Medieval Mystical Tradition in England," in *The Medieval Mystical Tradition in England,* ed. Marion Glasscoe, 47–62. University of Exeter Press, 1982.

Lowe, Jeremy. *Desiring Truth: The Process of Judgment in Fourteenth-Century Art and Literature.* Studies in Medieval History and Culture. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Machan, Tim. *Textual Criticism and Middle English Texts*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1994.

Mâle, Émile. *Religious Art in France: The Late Middle Ages: A Study of Medieval Iconography and its Sources,* ed. Harry Bober, trans. Marthiel Matthews. Princeton University Press, 1986.

Marion, Jean-Luc. *God without Being: Hors-Texte*, trans. Thomas A. Carlson. University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Marks, Richard. *Image and Devotion in Late Medieval England*. Thrupp: Sutton Publishing, 2004.

Martin, Edward James. *A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy.* London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1930.

McFarlane, K. B. *John Wycliffe and the Beginnings of English Nonconformity.* London: English Universities Press, 1953.

McGregor, James. "The Iconography of Chaucer in Hoccleve's *De Regimine Principum* and in the *Troilus* Frontispiece." *The Chaucer Review* 11 (1977): 338–50.

McNamer, Sarah. "Feeling," in Strohm (ed.), 241–57.

Medcalf, Stephen. "Inner and Outer," in *The Later Middle Ages*, ed. Stephen Medcalf, 108–71. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1981.

Meyer-Lee, Robert J. *Poets and Power from Chaucer to Wyatt*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Milbank, John, Catherine Pickstock, and Graham Ward (eds.). *Radical Orthodoxy: A New Theology*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Mills, David. "The Voices of Thomas Hoccleve," in *Essays on Thomas Hoccleve*, ed. Catherine Batt, 85–108. Turnhout: Brepols, 1996.

Minnis, A. J. *Chaucer and Pagan Antiquity*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1982.

  Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes of the Later Middle Ages. 2nd edn. London: Scolar Press, 1988.

  "Medieval Imagination and Memory," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. II, ed. Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson, 239–74. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

  and A. B. Scott (eds.). *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism, c. 1100–1375: The Commentary-Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Mitchell, Jerome. *Thomas Hoccleve: A Study in Early Fifteenth-Century English Poetic*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968.

Mitchell, W. J. T. *Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology*. University of Chicago Press, 1986.

  Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation. University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Morgan, Nigel. "Texts and Images of Marian Devotion in Fourteenth-Century England," in *England in the Fourteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1991 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Nicholas Rogers, 34–57. Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1993.

  "Texts and Images of Marian Devotion in English Twelfth-Century Monasticism, and Their Influence on the Secular Church," in *Monasteries and Society in Medieval Britain: Proceedings of the 1994 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Benjamin Thompson. Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1999.

Morse, Ruth. *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation, and Reality*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Mueller, Janel M. *The Native Tongue and the Word: Developments in English Prose Style, 1380–1580*. University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Newman, Barbara. "What Did it Mean to Say 'I Saw'?: The Clash between Theory and Practice in Medieval Visionary Culture." *Speculum* 80:1 (2005): 1–43.

Nichols, Ann Eljenholm. "Books-for-Laymen: The Demise of a Commonplace." *Church History* 56 (1987): 457–73.

Nissé, Ruth. "Reversing Discipline: *The Tretise of Miraclis Pleyinge*, Lollard Exegesis, and the Failure of Representation." *YLS* 11 (1997): 163–94.

"'Oure Fadres Olde and Modres': Gender, Heresy, and Hoccleve's Literary Politics." *SAC* 21 (1999): 275–99.

"'Was it not Routhe to Se?': Lydgate and the Styles of Martyrdom," in *John Lydgate: Poetry, Culture, and Lancastrian England,* ed. Larry Scanlon and James Simpson, 279–98. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.

Nolan, Maura. "The Art of Writing History: Lydgate's *Serpent of Division*." *Speculum* 78 (2003): 99–127.

"Beauty," in Strohm (ed.), 207–21.

O'Connor, Mary Catharine. *The Art of Dying Well: The Development of the Ars Moriendi*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.

Owst, G.R. *The Destructorium Viciorum of Alexander Carpenter: A Fifteenth-Century Sequel to Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*. London: SPCK, 1952.

Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1961.

Palmer, H. P. *The Bad Abbot of Evesham and other Mediaeval Studies*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1932.

Panofsky, E. "Imago Pietatis," in *Festschrift für Max J. Friedländer,* 261–308. Leipzig: E. E. Seemann, 1927.

Parker, Sir William. *The History of Long Melford*. London: Wyman & Sons, 1873.

Pasnau, Robert. *Theories of Cognition in the Later Middle Ages*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Patrouch, Joseph. *Reginald Pecock*. New York: Twayne, 1970.

Patterson, Lee. "On the Margin: Postmodernism, Ironic History, and Medieval Studies." *Speculum* 65 (1990): 87–108.

"Making Identities in the Fifteenth Century: Henry V and Lydgate," in *New Historical Literary Study*, ed. Jeffrey Cox and Larry Reynolds, 67–107. Princeton University Press, 1993.

"'What is Me?': Self and Society in the Poetry of Thomas Hoccleve." *SAC* 23 (2001): 437–70.

Pearsall, Derek. *John Lydgate*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1970.

"John Capgrave's *Life of St. Katherine* and Popular Romance Style." *Medievalia et Humanistica* 6 (1975): 121–37.

"Chaucer and Lydgate," in *Chaucer Traditions: Studies in Honour of Derek Brewer*, ed. Ruth Morse and Barry Windeatt, 39–53. Cambridge University Press, 1990.

"Hoccleve's *Regement of Princes*: The Poetics of Self-Representation." *Speculum* 69 (1994): 386–410.

John Lydgate (1371–1449): A Bio-bibliography. English Literary Studies 71. Victoria, BC: University of Victoria, 1997.

Peck, Russell. "Chaucer and Nominalist Questions." *Speculum* 53 (1978): 745–60.

Peikola, Matti. "'And After All, Myn Ave-Marie Almost to the End': *Pierce the Ploughman's Crede* and Lollard Expositions of the *Ave Maria*." *English Studies* 81 (2000): 273–92.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Imago Dei: The Byzantine Apologia for Icons*. Princeton University Press, 1990.

Perkins, Nicholas. "Thomas Hoccleve, *La Male Regle*," in *A Companion to Medieval English Literature and Culture, c. 1350–1500,* ed. Peter Brown, 585–603. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.

Pfaff, R. W. *New Liturgical Feasts in Later Medieval Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

Rex, Richard. *The Lollards*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Rice, Nicole R. *Lay Piety and Religious Discipline in Middle English Literature*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Rigg, A. G. "Hoccleve's *Complaint* and Isidore of Seville." *Speculum* 45 (1970): 564–74.

Ringbom, Sixten. *Icon to Narrative: The Rise of the Dramatic Close-Up in Fifteenth-Century Devotional Painting*. Doornspijk: Davaco, 1984.

Robertson, Kellie. "Medieval Things: Materiality, Historicism, and the Premodern Object." *Literature Compass* 5/6 (2008): 1060–80.

Rosen, Edward. "The Invention of Eyeglasses." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 11:1 (1950): 13–47; and 11:2 (1956): 183–218.

Ross, T. W. "Five Fifteenth-Century 'Emblem' Verses from British Museum Additional MS 37049." *Speculum* 32 (1957): 274–82.

Rowland, Beryl. *Animals with Human Faces*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1973.

Rubiés, Joan-Pau. "Theology, Ethnography, and the Historicization of Idolatry." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67:4 (2006): 571–96.

Rudolph, Conrad. *The "Things of Greater Importance": Bernard of Clairvaux's Apologia and the Medieval Attitude toward Art*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.

Russell, J. Stephen. "Allegorical Monstrosity: The Case of Deguileville." *Allegorica* 5 (1980): 95–103.

Russell-Smith, Joy. "Walter Hilton and a Tract in Defense of the Veneration of Images." *Dominican Studies* 7 (1954): 180–214.

Salih, Sarah. "Introduction," in *A Companion to Middle English Hagiography*, ed. Sarah Salih. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2006.

Salter, Elizabeth. *Fourteenth-Century English Poetry: Contexts and Readings*. Oxford University Press, 1983.

Sanok, Catherine. *Her Life Historical: Exemplarity and Female Saints' Lives in Late Medieval England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Scanlon, Larry. "The King's Two Voices: Narrative and Power in Hoccleve's *Regiment of Princes*," in *Literary Practice and Social Change in Britain, 1380–1530*, ed. Lee Patterson, 216–47. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Narrative, Authority and Power: The Medieval Exemplum and the Chaucerian Tradition. Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Scarry, Elaine. *On Beauty and Being Just.* Princeton University Press, 1999.

Scase, Wendy. "Reginald Pecock, John Carpenter and John Colop's 'Common-Profit' Books: Aspects of Book Ownership and Circulation in Fifteenth-Century London." *Medium Aevum* 61 (1992): 261–75.

Reginald Pecock. Authors of the Middle Ages 8. Aldershot: Variorum, 1996.

Literature and Complaint in England, 1272–1553. Oxford University Press, 2007.

Scattergood, V. J. *Politics and Poetry in the Fifteenth Century*. London: Blandford Press, 1971.

"*Pierce the Ploughman's Crede*: Lollardy and Texts," in *Lollardy and the Gentry in the Later Middle Ages,* ed. Margaret Aston and Colin Richmond, 77–94. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Schade, H. "Die Libri Carolini und ihre Stellung zum Bild." *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 79 (1957): 69–78.

Schiller, Gertrud. *Iconography of Christian Art*, trans. Janet Seligman. Greenwich, CT.: New York Graphic Society, 1971.

Schirmer, Walter. *John Lydgate: A Study in the Culture of the XVth Century*, trans. Ann E. Keep. London: Methuen, 1961.

Seymour, Michael (M.C.). "Manuscript Portraits of Chaucer and Hoccleve." *The Burlington Magazine* 124 (1982): 618–23.

John Capgrave. Authors of the Middle Ages 11. Aldershot: Variorum, 1996.

Seznec, Jean. *The Survival of the Pagan Gods: The Mythological Tradition and its Place in Renaissance Humanism and Art*. Princeton University Press, 1972.

Simpson, James. "Madness and Texts: Hoccleve's *Series*," in *Chaucer and Fifteenth-Century Poetry*, ed. Julia Boffey and Janet Cowen, 15–29. London: King's College London Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, 1991.

"Bulldozing the Middle Ages: The Case of John Lydgate." *New Medieval Literatures* 4 (2001): 213–42.

Reform and Cultural Revolution. Oxford English Literary History 2. Oxford University Press, 2002.

"Reginald Pecock and John Fortesque," in Edwards (ed.), 271–87.

Smalley, Beryl. *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1960.

Somerset, Fiona. *Clerical Discourse and Lay Audience in Late Medieval England*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

"Expanding the Langlandian Canon: Radical Latin and the Stylistics of Reform." *YLS* 17 (2003): 73–92.

"Wycliffite Prose," in Edwards (ed.), 195–214.

"'Hard is with seyntis for to make affray': Lydgate the 'Poet-Propagandist' as Hagiographer," in *John Lydgate: Poetry, Culture, and Lancastrian England,* ed. Larry Scanlon and James Simpson, 258–78. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.

"Afterward," in *Wycliffite Controversies,* ed. Mishtooni Bose and J. Patrick Hornbeck. Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming 2011.

Spencer, H. (Helen) Leith. *English Preaching in the Late Middle Ages.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

"Sermon Literature," in Edwards (ed.), 151–70.

Spiegel, Gabrielle. *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Stanbury, Sarah. "The Vivacity of Images: St. Katherine, Knighton's Lollards, and the Breaking of Idols," in Dimmick *et al.* (eds.), 131–50.

The Visual Object of Desire in Late Medieval England. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Steiner, Emily. *Documentary Culture and the Making of Medieval English Literature.* Cambridge University Press, 2003.

and Candace Barrington (eds.). *The Letter of the Law: Legal Practice and Literary Production in Medieval England.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Stevens, Martin. *Four Middle English Mystery Cycles: Textual, Contextual, and Critical Interpretations.* Princeton University Press, 1987.

Straker, Scott-Morgan. "Deference and Difference: Lydgate, Chaucer, and the *Siege of Thebes.*" *The Review of English Studies* 52 (2001): 1–21.

Strohm, Paul. "Chaucer's Fifteenth-Century Audience and the Narrowing of the 'Chaucer Tradition.'" *SAC* 4 (1982): 3–32.

England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399–1422. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Politique: Languages of Statecraft between Chaucer and Shakespeare. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005.

(ed.). *Oxford Twenty-First Century Approaches to Literature: Middle English.* Oxford University Press, 2007.

Summit, Jennifer. "Topography as Historiography: Petrarch, Chaucer, and the Making of Medieval Rome." *JMEMS* 30:2 (2000): 211–46.

Tachau, Katherine. *Vision and Certitude in the Age of Ockham: Optics, Epistemology and the Foundations of Semantics, 1250–1345.* Leiden: Brill, 1988.

Thomas, A. *Die Darstellung Christi in der Kelter: eine theologische und kulturhistorische Studie.* Düsseldorf, 1936; facsimile repr. 1981.

Thornley, Eva. "The Middle English Penitential Lyric and Hoccleve's Autobiographical Poetry." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 3 (1967): 295–321.

Tolmie, Sarah. "The *Prive Scilence* of Thomas Hoccleve." *SAC* 22 (2000): 281–309.

"The Professional: Thomas Hoccleve." *SAC* 29 (2007): 341–73.

Torti, Anna. *The Glass of Form: Mirroring Structures from Chaucer to Skelton.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1991.

Trapp, J. B. "Verses by Lydgate at Long Melford." *The Review of English Studies* 6 (1955): 1–11.

Tristram, E. W. *English Wall Painting of the Fourteenth Century.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1955.

Tuve, Rosamund. *Allegorical Imagery: Some Medieval Books and their Posterity.* Princeton University Press, 1966.

Ugolnik, Anthony. "The *Libri Carolini*: Antecedents of Reformation Iconoclasm," in *Iconoclasm vs. Art and Drama*, ed. Clifford Davidson and Ann Eljenholm Nichols, 1–32. Early Drama, Art and Music Monograph Series 11. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1989.

Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet). "Idole, Idolatre, Idolatrie." *Dictionnaire Philosophique,* ed. B. Didier, 291–304. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1994.

von Nolcken, Christina. "Some Alphabetical Compendia and How Preachers Used Them in Fourteenth-Century England." *Viator* 12 (1981): 271–88.

"*Piers Plowman*, the Wycliffites, and *Pierce the Plowman's Creed*." *YLS* 2 (1988): 71–102.

"'O, why ne had y lerned for to die?': *Lerne to Dye* and the Author's Death in Thomas Hoccleve's *Series*," in *Essays in Medieval Studies* 10, ed. A. J. Frantzen, 27–51. Chicago: Illinois Medieval Association, 1993.

"A 'Certain Sameness' and our Response to it in English Wycliffite Texts," in *Literature and Religion in the Later Middle Ages: Philological Studies in Honor of Siegfried Wenzel*, ed. R. Newhauser and John Alford, 191–208. Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1995.

Wakelin, M. F. "A Note on Preaching: 'Roodes, and Othyr Ymages' in Mediaeval England." *Downside Review* 103 (1985): 76–85.

Wallace, David (ed.). *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature.* Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Warner, Lawrence. "Jesus the Jouster: The Christ-Knight and Medieval Theories of Atonement in *Piers Plowman* and the 'Round Table' Sermons." *YLS* 10 (1996): 129–43.

Watson, Nicholas. "Censorship and Cultural Change in Late-Medieval England: Vernacular Theology, the Oxford Translation Debate, and Arundel's Constitutions of 1409." *Speculum* 70 (1995): 822–64.

"Conceptions of the Word: The Mother Tongue and the Incarnation of God." *New Medieval Literatures* 1 (1997): 85–124.

"'Et que est huius ydoli materia? Tuipse': Idols and Images in Walter Hilton," in Dimmick *et al.* (eds.), 95–111.

"Vernacular Apocalyptic: On *The Lanterne of Liȝt*." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 47 (2003): 115–27.

Waugh, W. T. "Sir John Oldcastle." *The English Historical Review* 20, no. 79 (1905): 434–56.

"Sir John Oldcastle (Continued)." *The English Historical Review* 20, no. 80 (1905): 637–58.

Weckworth, A. "Christus in der Kelter: Ursprung und Wandlungen eines Bildmotives," in *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte: eine Festgabe für Heinz Rudolf Rosemann zum 9. Oktober 1960,* ed. Ernst Guldan, 95–108. Munich, Berlin, 1960.

Weldon, James. "Sabotaged Text or Textual Ploy? The Christ-Knight Metaphor in *Piers Plowman*." *Florilegium* 9 (1987): 113–23.

White, T. H. (trans.). *The Bestiary: A Book of Beasts, being a Translation from a Latin Bestiary of the Twelfth Century.* New York: Putnam, 1954.

Whitehead, Christiania. *Castles of the Mind: A Study of Medieval Architectural Allegory.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2003.

Wichgraf, Wiltrud. "Suso's *Horologium Sapientiae* in England nach Handschriften des 15 Jahrhunderts." *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 169 (1936): 176–81.

Winstead, Karen. "Piety, Politics, and Social Commitment in Capgrave's *Life of Saint Katherine*." *Medievalia et Humanistica* n.s. 17 (1990): 59–80.

  Virgin Martyrs: Legends of Sainthood in Late Medieval England. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997.

  John Capgrave's Fifteenth Century. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

  "Saintly Exemplarity," in Strohm (ed.), 335–51.

Witt, Ronald. "Coluccio Salutati and the Conception of the *Poeta Theologus* in the Fourteenth Century." *Renaissance Quarterly* 30:4 (1977): 538–63.

Woolf, Rosemary. *The English Religious Lyric in the Middle Ages.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Zeeman, Nicolette. "The Idol of the Text," in Dimmick *et al.* (eds.), 43–62.

Index

1 Robin Kirkpatrick *Dante's Inferno: Difficulty and Dead Poetry*

2 Jeremy Tambling *Dante and Difference: Writing in the "Commedia"*

3 Simon Gaunt *Troubadours and Irony*

4 Wendy Scase *"Piers Plowman" and the New Anticlericalism*

5 Joseph Duggan *The "Cantar De Mio Cid": Poetic Creation in its Economic and Social Contexts*

6 Roderick Beaton *The Medieval Greek Romance*

7 Kathryn Kerby-Fulton *Reformist Apocalypticism and "Piers Plowman"*

8 Alison Morgan *Dante and the Medieval Other World*

9 Eckehard Simon (ed.) *The Theatre of Medieval Europe: New Research in Early Drama*

10 Mary Carruthers *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*

11 Rita Copeland *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*

12 Donald Maddox *The Arthurian Romances of Chrétien de Troyes: Once and Future Fictions*

13 Nicholas Watson *Richard Rolle and the Invention of Authority*

14 Steven F. Kruger *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*

15 Barbara Nolan *Chaucer and the Tradition of the "Roman Antique"*

16 Sylvia Huot *The "Romance of the Rose" and its Medieval Readers: Interpretations, Reception, Manuscript Transmission*

17 Carol M. Meale (ed.) *Women and Literature in Britain, 1150–1500*

18 Henry Ansgar Kelly *Ideas and Forms of Tragedy from Aristotle to the Middle Ages*

19 Martin Irvine *The Making of Textual Culture: Grammatica and Literary Theory, 350–1100*

20 Larry Scanlon *Narrative, Authority and Power: The Medieval Exemplum and the Chaucerian Tradition*

21 Erik Kooper *Medieval Dutch Literature in its European Context*

22 Steven Botterill *Dante and the Mystical Tradition: Bernard of Clairvaux in the "Commedia"*

23 Peter Biller and Anne Hudson (eds.) *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530*